The Dissertation Committee for Jean Anne Lauer Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Mexican Film Festivals and Industry Development: Guanajuato, Guadalajara, and Morelia, and the Reemergence of a National Film Industry

Committee:

Thomas Schatz, Co-Supervisor

Charles Ramírez Berg, Co-Supervisor

Joseph D. Straubhaar

Maria D. Wade

Hector Amaya

Mexican Film Festivals and Industry Development: Guanajuato, Guadalajara, and Morelia, and the Reemergence of a National Film Industry

by

Jean Anne Lauer, B.A.; M.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

December 2016

Dedication

To my grandmothers.

Acknowledgements

As everyone who knows me is acutely aware, this project has been a few more years in the making than I expected it would be when I began my studies at the University of Texas at Austin. It is no exaggeration to say that, like many who have completed doctorates before me and those yet to do so, I likely would have packed it up and walked away long ago were it not for the amazing mentors, colleagues, counselors, members of the film community, family members, and friends who cheered me on in good times and cheered me up through tough times. I feel truly honored and humbled by their unwavering confidence in me and in the work here presented, which would not have been possible without their support.

First and foremost, I would like to thank the co-supervisors of the dissertation committee, Tom Schatz and Charles Ramírez Berg. When I met with them a few years ago and told them I wanted to set aside my first dissertation topic idea, and instead pursue this one, they encouraged me to follow the path that I was more passionate about. Since then, as I juggled degree requirements with two to three part-time jobs at any given time, all of which I was also passionate about, Tom and Charles provided direction and input and saw my work through to completion. Our conversations through the years challenged, motivated, and enlightened me. Each of the other committee members, Joe Straubhaar, Mariah Wade, and Hector Amaya, also generously offered their time and feedback, and my work is all the better for it.

Additionally, I am incredibly thankful to all of the members of the Mexican film industry who inspired the inquiries herein, who shared their stories with me, who answered my questions patiently, who sent me document after document, who connected

me with other key contacts, and so much more. I especially express thanks to Sarah Hoch, Andrea Stavenhagen, Pepe Elo, Carlos Taibo, and Víctor Ugalde; it is no understatement to say that they opened doors that changed my life. I am indebted to everyone I have met these years through EEC/GIFF, FICG, FICM, and IMCINE, as well as to each of the filmmakers interviewed for this project. At the most fundamental level, this dissertation would not have been possible without all of you. The generosity you have shown me, and the commitment you maintain for your vocations, are equally inspirational.

To all of the friends and family members who have been there along the way, who listened, laughed, cried, worked, argued, cooked, imbibed, or otherwise spent time in good company with me, thank you. I am where I am today because my life has been blessed with the presence of Morgan Blue, Elizabeth Hansen, Tery Lopez, Claudia Rivera Aubert, Shelley Rodrigo, Afsheen Nomai, Marnie Binfield, Elena Bessire, Chale Nafus, Hebe Tabachnik, Gloria Holder, Julie Larrea, Marnie Liebert Barnes, Anne Marie Ferguson-Sampson, Alex Kwiecinski, Tony Kwiecinski, Nick Kwiecinski, Carrie Kwiecinski, and many others whom I hold dear in my heart.

No amount of thank yous would be complete without acknowledgement and props to Joshua Kupecki. You have provided, along with Bart and Nigel, comfort and emotional shelter during the times I have struggled or despaired; you've believed in me when I was unable to believe in myself; you've danced in joy with me at all hours of day or night. Your love and strength are so deep, your faith in me so steadfast, that the words "Thank You," while whole-hearted, seem insufficient. I love you, Josh K.

And, finally, to everyone here unnamed, you know who you are and I am eternally grateful for you. ¡Mil gracias!

Mexican Film Festivals and Industry Development: Guanajuato, Guadalajara, and Morelia, and the Reemergence of a National Film Industry

Jean Anne Lauer, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2016

Supervisors: Thomas Schatz and Charles Ramírez Berg

The Mexican film industry has experienced substantial ups and downs in terms of how many films national filmmakers have produced annually, as well as whether or not these films have reached audiences at home or abroad. In the late 1990s and early 2000s, production and exhibition numbers were at some of the lowest levels the nation had ever known. By 2014, national production was not only recovering but reaching levels on par with the Mexican Golden Age of cinema of the 1950s. In the context of other factors, this project's primary inquiry explores the rise of three leading Mexican film festivals and the creation of initiatives, through these festivals, aimed at bolstering national film production in the early 21st century. The festivals are, in order of founding, the Guadalajara International Film Festival (FICG), the Guanajuato International Film Festival (GIFF), and the Morelia International Film Festival (FICM). Stepping outside their traditional role of exhibiting completed films, and following other film industry leaders including Sundance, Cannes, Berlin, and Rotterdam, by 2005, each of these festivals had launched events dedicated to supporting films in development or preproduction. The history and reputation of the film festivals provides the background to an analysis of the role of such events or initiatives and their impact on national film

production. The research conducted and analyzed for the project included interviews with festival directors, initiative coordinators, filmmakers, and government representatives, all of whom were invested in a particular outcome for Mexican cinema: increased national production and international coproduction. This project concludes that their efforts were most effective in the area of addressing a particular weakness that the Mexican film industry was suffering from: in the late 1990s, a shortage of trained, professional, producers with the capacity to helm viable film projects meant that few films could be made per year. In coordination with other invested partners, the festivals sought to address this weakness by focusing their initiatives on networking and capacity-building for producers, and early results indicate that FICG, GIFF, FICM have achieved such benchmarks. This project's inquiries bridge contemporary media industry studies, Mexican film history, and film festival studies, the intersection of which provides for significant contributions to each field and together illustrate the need for more in-depth research and analysis in these areas. For this study, the focus is on how their festival initiatives have shaped the field of film production within the Mexican national cinematic landscape, and represents the first systematic study of this new development not only in Mexican film, but beyond.

Table of Contents

List of Tables xv

Chapter 1: Introduction 1

Project Overview 8

Case Study and Interview Overview 20

Festival Internacional de Cine Guanajuato (GIFF, Guanajuato International Film Festival) 21

GIFF Case Studies 24

Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara (FICG, Guadalajara International Film Festival) 26

FICG Case Studies 29

Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia (FICM, Morelia International Film Festival) 30

FICM Case Studies 32

Primary Research Methods and Sources 34

Conclusion 37

Chapter 2: Mexican Film History 40

Mexican Film History 41

1896 to late 1920s: Silent Film Era 42

1930s to late 1950s: Sound Cinema, the Mexican Golden Age, and Industry Consolidation 44

1960s to early 1990s: Decline, Renovation, Commercialism, Collapse 46

1990s to Early 2000s: Globalization and New Strategies 53

Chapter 3: Film Industry Contexts and Film Festival Industry Initiatives 69

Development: Film Industry Contexts and Definitions 71

Development as Business Model 73

The "Big Six"—Hollywood's Major Studios 76

Independent Studios and Filmmakers 81

Film Festivals, "Indie" Cinema, and the Cult of the Auteur 88

Film Festivals: The Move towards Industry Development 94
Theory: National Cinema, Film Festivals, and Industrial Stakeholders.....98
Mexican Film History, Film Festivals, and Industry Renovation 108

Chapter 4: Guanajuato: "Expresión en Corto" and Mexico's First International Pitching Market 114
Overview: From "Expresión en Corto" to "Guanajuato International Film Festival".....120
Expresión en Corto Prior to the International Pitching Market, 1998 to 2003 121
From EEC's IPM to GIFF's "Supporting the Creation of a Solid Film Industry" 128
Mexico's First International Pitching Market 139
La Ticla / Amar a morir (Love 'Till Death): Participant in 3IPM (2006) 149
La brújula la lleva el muerto (The Compass Is Carried by the Dead Man): Participant in 4IPM (2007) 156
Conclusions, GIFF and the International Pitching Market 2004-2011 161

Chapter 5: Guadalajara: From Mexican Showcase to International Film Festival, Market, and Coproduction Meeting 170
Overview: From "Muestra de Cine Mexicano" to "Guadalajara International Film Festival" 178
Muestra de Cine Mexicano Prior to the First Guadalajara Film Market, 1986 to 2001 180
From "Muestra" to "Industry" Leader.....196
Mexico's Ibero-American Film Market, the Encuentro de Coproducción, and Leader in Industry.....210
Cinco días sin Nora (Nora's Will): Participant in I Encuentro de Coproducción (2005).....221
Vaho (Becloud): Participant in III Encuentro de Coproducción (2007) 226
Conclusions, FICG and the Encuentro de Coproducción 2005-2011 233

Chapter 6: Morelia: A Festival for Mexican Talent and Host of Morelia Lab....243
Overview: Morelia International Film Festival.....249

From the Cineteca Nacional to Morelia, 2003-2006 250
Consolidating the Mexican Film Festival "par excellence" 259
A Workshop for Producers: Morelia Lab 267
Pastorela: Participant in Morelia Lab 2007 278
Fecha de caducidad (Expiration Date): Participant in Morelia Lab 2009 283
Conclusions, FICM and Morelia Lab 2005-2011 289
Chapter 7: Conclusion 298
Appendices 319
Appendix A: Acronyms 319
Appendix B: Projects Selected for Participation in the 1st International Pitching Market, Expresión en Corto International Film Festival, Guanajuato, Mexico, 2004 322
1IPM – Mexican Narrative Projects 322
Appendix C: Projects Selected for Participation in the 2nd International Pitching Market, Expresión en Corto International Film Festival, Guanajuato, Mexico, 2005 324
2IPM – Mexican Narrative Projects 324
Appendix D: Projects Selected for Participation in the 3rd International Pitching Market, Expresión en Corto International Film Festival, Guanajuato, Mexico, 2006 326
3IPM – Mexican Narrative Projects 326
Appendix E: Projects Selected for Participation in the 4th International Pitching Market, Expresión en Corto International Film Festival, Guanajuato, Mexico, 2007 327
4IPM – Mexican Narrative Projects 327
4IPM – Additional Project 327
Appendix F: Projects Selected for Participation in the 5th International Pitching Market, Expresión en Corto International Film Festival, Guanajuato, Mexico, 2008 328
5IPM – Crossover Projects 328
5IPM – MexiCannes Projects 328

Appendix G: Projects Selected for Participation in the 6th International Pitching Market, Expresión en Corto International Film Festival, Guanajuato, Mexico, 2009 329

6IPM – Mexican Narrative Projects 329

6IPM – Additional Projects 330

Appendix H: Projects Selected for Participation in the 7th International Pitching Market, Expresión en Corto International Film Festival, Guanajuato, Mexico, 2010 331

7IPM – Mexican Narrative Projects 331

7IPM – Additional Projects 332

Appendix I: Projects Selected for Participation in the 8th International Pitching Market, Expresión en Corto International Film Festival, Guanajuato, Mexico, 2011 333

8IPM – Mexican Narrative Projects 333

8IPM – Additional Projects 334

Appendix J: Projects Selected for Participation in the 1st Encuentro Iberoamericano de Coproducción Cinematográfica, Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara, Mexico, 2005 335

I Encuentro – Mexican Narrative Projects (Produced or Co-Produced) 335

I Encuentro – Additional Projects 336

Appendix K: Projects Selected for Participation in the 2nd Encuentro Iberoamericano de Coproducción Cinematográfica, Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara, Mexico, 2006 337

II Encuentro – Mexican Narrative Projects (Produced or Co-Produced) 337

II Encuentro – Additional Projects 338

Appendix L: Projects Selected for Participation in the 3rd Encuentro Iberoamericano de Coproducción Cinematográfica, Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara, Mexico, 2007 339

III Encuentro – Mexican Narrative Projects (Produced or Co-Produced) 339

III Encuentro – Additional Projects 340

Appendix M: Projects Selected for Participation in the 4th Encuentro Iberoamericano de Coproducción Cinematográfica, Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara, Mexico, 2008 341

IV Encuentro – Mexican Narrative Projects (Produced or Co-Produced) 341

IV Encuentro – Additional Projects 342

Appendix N: Projects Selected for Participation in the 5th Encuentro Iberoamericano de Coproducción Cinematográfica, Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara, Mexico, 2009 344

V Encuentro – Mexican Narrative Projects (Produced or Co-Produced) 344

V Encuentro – Additional Projects 345

Appendix O: Projects Selected for Participation in the 6th Encuentro Iberoamericano de Coproducción Cinematográfica, Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara, Mexico, 2010 347

VI Encuentro – Mexican Narrative Projects (Produced or Co-Produced) 347

VI Encuentro – Additional Projects 348

Appendix P: Projects Selected for Participation in the 7th Encuentro Iberoamericano de Coproducción Cinematográfica, Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara, Mexico, 2011 351

VII Encuentro – Mexican Narrative Projects (Produced or Co-Produced) 351

VII Encuentro – Additional Projects 352

Appendix Q: Projects Selected for Participation in Morelia Lab 2005, Mexico City + Festival de Cine Internacional de Morelia, Mexico 354

2005 Morelia Lab – Mexican Projects 354

Appendix R: Projects Selected for Participation in Morelia Lab 2007, Festival de Cine Internacional de Morelia, Mexico 357

2007 Morelia Lab – Mexican Projects (Produced or Co-Produced) .357

2007 Morelia Lab – Additional Projects 358

Appendix S: Projects Selected for Participation in Morelia Lab 2009, Festival de Cine Internacional de Morelia, Mexico 359

2009 Morelia Lab – Mexican Projects (Produced or Co-Produced) .359

2009 Morelia Lab – Additional Projects 360

Appendix T: Projects Selected for Participation in Morelia Lab 2011, Festival de Cine Internacional de Morelia, Mexico 361

2011 Morelia Lab – Mexican Projects (Produced or Co-Produced) .361

2011 Morelia Lab – Additional Projects 361

Bibliography 363

Vita 386

List of Tables

Table 1: Feature Film Production in Mexico 1991-2014 2

Table 2: Box Office Revenue in Mexico in Thousands of Pesos (1991-2014) ..58

Table 3: Overview of Mexican Projects' Status from the International Pitching Market (IPM) 2004-2011 164

Table 4: Overview of Mexican Projects' Status from the Encuentro de Coproducción, 2005-2011 235

Table 5: Overview of Mexican Projects' Status from Morelia Lab, 2005-2011.....291

Chapter 1: Introduction

> Wherever a festival is born, immediately the need for expression is born, because it cultivates an audience and once that audience is cultivated, it wants to express itself. Festivals are really great fashioners of audiences, and if you know how to do it well, you end up creating filmmakers in the regions around you.
> - Víctor Ugalde, Director of the Mexican Directors' Association[1]

According to the Instituto Mexicano de la Cinematografía (the Mexican Cinematographic Institute, or IMCINE), 1997 marked an especially bleak year for the film industry in Mexico. In IMCINE's historical timeline, the headline for the month of December 1997 read "Colapso industrial" or "Industrial collapse" (México, IMCINE, Línea de tiempo). This is understandable, as during that year only nine feature films were produced, seven of which were supported by state funds. The history of Mexico's film industry had surely seen its ups and downs in terms of numbers of films produced annually, as well as varied critical or commercial success stories. However, national economic crises in the 1980s along with changing political climates and appointments had undermined much of the infrastructure that had been in place earlier; another wave of crises which were accompanied by the privatization of national industries in the late 1980s and early 1990s resulted in widespread dismantling of production facilities and exhibition outlets.

Yet, despite this downturn and the long odds Mexican filmmakers faced, just a little over a decade later, the industry showed signs not only of rebounding, but of rejuvenation and future potential on both the domestic and international fronts.

---

[1] Víctor Ugalde, personal interview, 09 May 2013. Translated from Spanish. Translations of cited quotes within this dissertation are mine from sources as indicated.

Interview protocol for this research project was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Texas at Austin.

Year	Total Mexican films produced	No. produced with State support
1991	62	11
1992	58	12
1993	49	10
1994	28	8
1995	16	5
1996	17	7
1997	9	7
1998	11	9
1999	19	11
2000	28	17
2001	21	7
2002	14	7
2003	29	17
2004	36	25
2005	53	42
2006	64	34
2007	70	41
2008	70	57
2009	66	57
2010	69	59
2011	73	59
2012	112	70
2013	126	85
2014	130	94

Table 1: Feature Film Production in Mexico 1991-2014[2]

Whereas during the years 1995-97, Mexican film produced totaled a combined 42 feature films; from 2006 through 2011, that number jumped to at least 64 feature films per year.

[2] Sources: IMCINE online Línea de tiempo for years 1991-1999; IMCINE Anuario 2014 for years 2000-2014.

The turnaround was not immediate, as production totaled 14 features in 2002 and 29 in 2003. However, a turnaround it certainly was, and 2011 saw the production of 73 feature films, more than eight times the drastic low hit in 1997. In 2014, IMCINE tracked 130 feature films produced (Anuario 2014 19), a number that would have been inconceivable 15-20 years ago when the industry was in crisis.

The recovery in production numbers may be attributed to initiatives and structural changes within the Mexican film industry, and as evidenced from Table 1 above, funding by the Mexican government is a significant part of the story. The percentage of feature films completed that relied on state funding jumped from about 20% in 1992 and 1993, to over 80% from 2008 through 2011, with the remainder being funding from private sources. While the percentage of films funded 100% from private sources has gone back up, in the recent years of 2012 through 2014 representing about one-third to one-fourth of the total films produced annually, the state still clearly remained an investor in a majority of film productions. This funding is part of a larger story of industry renovation on many fronts, three of which are most relevant for understanding the context and purpose of this study:

- the revamping of the national Ley Cinematográfico (Cinematographic Law) in 1998;
- the development and deployment in the 2000s of three funding structures through the government, the Fondo para la Producción Cinematográfica de Calidad (Fund for the Production of Quality Films, or FOPROCINE), the Fondo de Inversión y Estímulos al Cine (Fund for Film Investment and Stimulation, or FIDECINE),

and the Estímulo Fiscal a la Producción Cinematográfica Nacional (Financial Stimulus for National Cinematic Production, or EFICINE);[3]

- the launching of initiatives through Mexican film festivals, beginning in 2004, aimed at fostering Mexican national production and international co-production.

The first two factors, the National Cinematographic Law and government stimulus funding, are described in upcoming sections, and provide a structural background to the main focus of the present investigation: the rise of three leading Mexican film festivals and the creation of initiatives aimed at bolstering national film production.

The festivals, in order of founding, are: the Guadalajara International Film Festival (FICG, Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara, which debuted as a festival in 1986); the Guanajuato International Film Festival (GIFF, formerly Festival Internacional de Cine "Expresión en Corto," debut 1998);[4] and the Morelia International Film Festival (FICM, Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia, debut 2003). By the early 2010s, they were established as leaders within the national landscape, as evidenced by IMCINE undertaking and publishing an impact study about these festivals as part of its 2011 annual statistical yearbook. In that yearbook, IMCINE recognized 87 festivals and film events as part of Mexico's alternative exhibition sites. Although including 87 festivals and events in their master list, IMCINE commissioned surveys and published accompanying extended reports about the perceived impacts on sectors including local

[3] FOPROCINE (Fund for the Production of Quality Films) was established in 1998 has been most active since 2001. FIDECINE (Fund for Film Investment and Stimulation) has been active since 2001/2002.

EFICINE (Financial Stimulus for National Cinematic Production) has been active since 2006. EFICINE was also referred to as "Eficine 226," and initially it was commonly referred to as "Ley 226" (Law 226) or "Artículo 226" (Article 226), referring to its original place in Mexican tax code and law.

[4] The name Expresión en Corto (EEC) is a play on words of sorts, as "Corto" means "short" as in the length of any object, and also it means "short film." The festival's name can be translated awkwardly as "Short Expressions," "Expressions in Short Form" or "Expressions in Short Film," but Expresión en Corto as an organization is always referred to as such, in Spanish. Since 2011, the festival has changed names. As of the time of this writing, it has rebranded itself officially the Guanajuato International Film Festival (GIFF), with its non-profit branch still named Expresión en Corto.

job creation, tourism, and the national film promotion, featuring only these three festivals: FICG, GIFF, and FICM (México, IMCINE, Anuario 2011 50-57). As will be elaborated upon in upcoming chapters, by 2011, the festivals not only were recognized within Mexico as impacting economic and film industry interests, they also were attracting attention in international contexts as they matured. In particular, FICG, GIFF, and FICM explicitly created initiatives targeted at drawing aspiring filmmakers and industry veterans to their locales, thereby generating buzz around not only film exhibition and distribution but also, very purposefully, to the state of national film production.

With respect to FICG, GIFF, and FICM, this project first must address the fact that film festival scholarship is a relatively new phenomenon in academia. As a nascent field of inquiry, the study of film festivals—as organizations with agency impacting the circulation of filmmakers and films—is underrepresented in the current landscape (e.g. Iordanova and Rhyne). In addition to this, studies of Mexican film published in the English language have traditionally constituted a niche area for academic research, one characterized by historical approaches and textual analyses of completed films.[5] The present research project takes off where these approaches to film scholarship leave off, by adding the histories of film festivals to the narrative record of Mexican film studies, histories which are largely missing from Spanish-language publications as well. Currently, much of the available information about FICG, GIFF, and FICM exists in disparate sources such as festival records and publications, newspapers and trades, and in the oral histories of the participants themselves. This project references these sources in order to compose narratives of the three particular festivals' histories, and subsequently,

[5] Both of these areas of inquiry, film festival scholarship and Mexican film studies, are returned to and discussed in further detail later in this chapter as well as in Chapter 3.

to evaluate the festivals in context, with the aim of contributing to the development of analytical frameworks in the burgeoning field of film festival scholarship.

Additionally, as a key component of the festival discussions and analyses, this project incorporates film production case studies into its sets of inquiries, two film case studies from each festival. The selected case studies are central to this investigation because each illustrates aspects of feature film production in contemporary Mexican contexts, primarily from the perspective of the producers and/or directors on the projects. The reasoning for this approach is two-fold. First, because a great deal of film histories and analyses are devoted to studying films once they are completed, whether that be through textual analyses or industrial studies. This approach obscures or even altogether elides the production process—that is, what a producer and the team around him/her actually go through to realize a completed project. It also obscures the fact that for every project completed, there are innumerable projects that people have worked on, for years, many of which will never see the light of day (e.g. Finney). If one is to truly understand producers' work and film production in context, it is important to learn from the producers about the process as they have navigated it beginning with concept, rather than with the completed film. Second, scholarship on film festivals has been focused primarily on the screenings, red carpets, and related events that festivals undertake, and which I will describe as "front of house" activities.[6] However, some film festivals also have been following a trend of incorporating film "industry" related events into their offerings, out of the limelight of general audiences, but front and center for filmmakers and film industry agents. Because access to such events is typically restricted, and concerned with film business prior to a film reaching general audiences, I designate them as "behind the

[6] Scholars Dina Iordanova, Marijke de Valck, and Skadi Loist have been particularly on the forefront of scholarship in these areas, including compiling existant research for reference by other researchers. An overview of scholarhips on film festivals follows later in this chapter, and is expanded upon in Chapter 3.

screens" activities.[7] FICG, GIFF, and FICM have all made the move to adding "behind the screens" divisions to their festival organization, beginning with FICG creating the Ibero-American Film Market in 2003, and a major component of each festival's endeavors is focused on pushing films in progress towards completion. As will be discussed later in this chapter, scholarship on film and festivals in general, and about festival industry activities in particular, have yet to focus much attention on these initiatives, even though they are part of the contemporary film industry's landscape and appear unlikely to go anywhere soon. Therefore, this study develops an area of inquiry currently marginalized at best, or at worst completely overlooked by academia.

When I initially conceived of this project, the research question I posed was aimed exclusively at forming a theoretical framework for evaluating film festival "behind the screens" activities related to film production or works in progress, as opposed to those concerned with completed films. Based on my experience with Mexico, I was interested in three of these activities in particular—the International Pitching Market (IPM) in Guanajuato, the Encuentro de Coproducción in Guadalajara,[8] and Morelia Lab in Morelia. Despite their differences, there was a common aim across the three of investing resources towards bolstering film production in Mexico. My hypothesis was that an assessment of the "success" or "failure" rates of the activities would be useful to the respective coordinating committees, their funders, and to filmmakers who were thinking about applying to participate. However, what I discovered was what I expressed in the above paragraph: foundational scholarship in the fields of (1) the film industry or

[7] These observations are based on scholarship including Tamara Falicov's work, and personal professional experience working in film festivals.

[8] Although official festival materials provide an English translation of the event's name as the Ibero-American Coproduction Meeting, it is still most common for industry professionals to refer to it in the original Spanish name of "Encuentro de Coproducción," or "Encuentro" for short.

industries and associated business practices, (2) film festivals, and (3) film festival initiatives geared towards film production as opposed to film projection, all proved to be much weaker than I had anticipated, especially but not only when it came to Mexican festivals and their initiatives. Because of this, I changed the direction of the project in order to prioritize laying the historical and related study foundations that were not available to me.

This project's contributions begin with historicizing particular festivals and industry activities, and analyzing ways in which the organization of these Mexican festivals have worked to establish their annual events as significant in the world film festival circuit. In addition to this, each chapter includes case studies which illustrate the experiences of select filmmakers who participated in FICG, GIFF, and FICM's industry activities, in order to expand upon existing scholarship and fill in gaps in intersecting fields within film studies: industrial analyses, including "Hollywood" vs. "indie" and national cinemas; contemporary Mexican film history and film production; and film festival scholarship. The following section introduces the primary concerns, terms, and subjects of this study, which will then be elaborated upon in subsequent chapters.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

An assessment of the past two decades of Mexican cinema and film festivals requires contextualization of a few major considerations, including balancing an understanding of the history of Mexican cinema as a national cinema (and the changes it has undergone from within) with an understanding of how it has operated over the past twenty years in comparison to Hollywood cinema, US independent cinema, and international art cinemas. The period from the 1990s to the present witnessed the consolidation and conglomeration of major entertainment institutions, which dominate a

substantial portion of the global film industry. At the same time, throughout the world, a number of institutions including independent production companies, cultural/arts-oriented funding entities, niche distribution companies, and film festivals, have attempted (with varying degrees of success) to support alternative options for filmmakers working outside of the major studio systems. Mexican filmmakers, their films, and film festivals, negotiate all of these terrains.

With respect to the Hollywood industrial model, which dominates film entertainment in the Americas, Mexico's industry has always had to balance a tension between wanting to learn from and be connected to Hollywood in certain contexts (like distribution), with the desire to retain autonomy vis-à-vis Hollywood's subsuming tendencies (especially in terms of homogenizing film productions to meet commercial interests). At a fundamental level, as with any national cinema, developing a Mexican national cinema requires that films and filmmakers maintain some recognizability as Mexican in origin and in the work that circulates in national and international markets; this is often at odds with Hollywood's entertainment model that aims for a product with universal and uniform mass audience appeal. Whether for these reasons or others, in the latter decades of the 20th century, Mexican cineastes have tended to look to Europe as opposed to mainstream Hollywood for inspiration. At the turn of the 21st century and to the present, younger generations of Mexican filmmakers including Alejandro González Iñárritu, Fernando Eimbcke, Nicolás Pereda, and Carlos Reygadas, have been especially inspired by contemporary trends in US independent film and the European art cinema models, where the idea of the film director as creative force has been privileged. All of these contexts and terms related to Hollywood, US independent cinema, and European art cinema are defined and discussed in more detail in Chapters 2 and 3 of this project.

While weathering the ups and downs of funding and film production infrastructure, constituents of the Mexican film industry have consistently attempted to carve out spaces for their films both domestically and internationally. The state's role in supporting—or failing to support—film production and distribution is key to the story as well. Laws and funds, such as the Ley Cinematográfico, FOPROCINE, FIDECINE, and EFICINE, have the potential to promote production, and as efforts like this have come and gone previously in Mexico, different waves of cinema have also waxed and waned. Efforts to boost theatrical screen share for Mexican film also have played a big part in the story. In the past few decades, one of the most significant structural changes in the way that films can reach audiences is also one of the least studied: film festivals. As venues for the presentation of curated selections, film festivals have become important sites of engagement with audiences for films and filmmakers. In Mexico, festivals have been recognized as serving as alternate distribution and exhibition circuits (México, IMCINE, Anuario 2011 49-52). At the same time, academia has also begun studying film festivals in these contexts.

Discussion of festival screenings will often deploy the terms distribution and exhibition, including for example the above-cited pages from IMCINE's Anuario 2011, in ways parallel to but sometimes distinct from Hollywood's definitions. In general, Hollywood's use of "exhibition" is linked explicitly to theatrical exhibition, where theatrical exhibition is the first tier or stage of distributing a film. The release in theaters paves the way for further distribution outlets, including pay TV options, cable, and DVD (ref. Balio). A distributor owning distribution rights aims to recoup investment and make a profit from the release of a film across multiple distribution outlets.

Competition for mainstream exhibition space is fierce, and dominated by Hollywood studio fare in the US, Mexico, and most other territories. A festival circuit

can offer an alternate venue for a film to be seen from that of the Hollywood-style theatrical exhibition release. Such alternate routes can potentially serve as part of a distributor's overall marketing strategy for a non-Hollywood film, which is why festivals are often studied as part of an alternative distribution circuit (e.g. de Valck and Loist). However, at times, festival fare competes directly with Hollywood exhibition circuits, and this overlap is what compels scholars such as Dina Iordanova to argue in these cases that "Screening the film at festivals is not a means of getting the film to real exhibition; it is the real exhibition" (25, emphasis in original). Iordanova argues that since festivals compete with other venues to book their films, and they engage audiences by screening films, they are best studied as sites of exhibition. She considers them part of the exhibition chain, specifically an exhibition venue, but one that needs content only sporadically as opposed to year-round (25-26). In this project, we will consider festivals an exhibition outlet in the sense that Iordanova understands them to be so, as it resonates with the film festival staff first-person accounts in interviews conducted by this author.

Although film festivals may be studied as exhibition outlets, behind the screens a whole other nexus of film festival initiatives has been taking off in two major areas of film business, especially over the past three decades: platforms for film sales and support for film production. Unlike the official festival selection and film screenings, which are aimed at an attending public who may or may not be in the film industry, the "behind the screens" activities are limited to vetted industry participants. Application, accreditation, registration, and participation are managed in an entirely different manner than that of general festival attendees. It has become more and more common for major film festivals, especially in Europe, to coordinate sales markets, co-production markets, and/or film funding awards or filmmaker residencies as part of their overall mission, beyond the scope of festival as annual exhibition event. In Europe, the Cannes Film Festival, the

Berlin International Film Festival (Berlinale), and the International Film Festival Rotterdam (IFFR) have led the way. In the US, the Sundance Film Festival and Institute set the benchmark (e.g. Falicov). In Mexico, three major film festivals expanded their operations in the early 2000s to incorporate one or more of the above-described "industry" initiatives. These festivals, all located outside of Mexico City, the nation's capital and entertainment industry nexus, are the afore-mentioned FICG in Guadalajara, GIFF in Guanajuato, and FICM in Morelia.

In the scope of human culture and history, film festivals are a relatively recent phenomenon; understandably, there has not yet been much academic attention paid to film festivals in general, and even less to the study of industry activities taking place "behind the screens," away from the limelight of headline-grabbing red carpets and other festivities. In Mexico, beginning with a film sales market created in Guadalajara in 2003, and followed within a couple years by other initiatives there as well as in Guanajuato and then Morelia, all three festivals have been investing time and money into creating and running events to attract film industry innovators and investors to their festivals. This has coincided with a surge in national film production numbers, which raises some questions for possible inquiry, including the basic one of what part the festival initiatives are actually playing in the grand scheme of Mexican cinema production. According to the respective festivals' publications, which are referenced in detail in Chapters 4 through 6, all of their initiatives purport to provide filmmakers with opportunities to access mentoring, networking, funding, and other support systems, thereby bolstering Mexican cinema production, co-production, and distribution.

This dissertation is particularly interested in analyzing festival support for films before they are completed, but production concerns cannot be discussed without considering national and transnational distribution networks, so the latter will also be

addressed at times as well. In historicizing Mexico's film festivals, the primary guiding questions that shaped the investigation were: Where do FICG, GIFF, and FICM fit historically into the trajectory of film exhibition in Mexico? How have they attempted to situate themselves as "must attend" events in film circuits? What industry-related events are film festivals designing and implementing in Mexico, and what inspirations led to their development? How have Mexican film festivals and filmmakers attempted to establish themselves as significant players in national and international contexts? At a more basic level, what is at stake within Mexico, from the filmmakers to the government, when international film festivals based in Mexico start explicitly working to connect Mexican filmmakers to national and international funds, producers, and distributors? Who are the primary stakeholders? What do the invested national and international players have to gain from participating in the film festival initiatives?

In undertaking this project, my initial observations were that within the nexus of the Mexican film industry, these three film festivals were taking steps to intervene at the level of national film production, and that they viewed this as a promising way to sustain and grow the industry as a whole. This observation has been confirmed by subsequent research, especially when talking with primary architects of the festival production support initiatives. These are, in chronological order: the International Pitching Market (IPM), held in Guanajuato in July of 2004 during the festival Expresión en Corto (now called GIFF); the "Encuentro Iberoamericano de Coproducción Cinematográfico" (Ibero-American Coproduction Meeting, or the "Encuentro") which launched in March of 2005 in Guadalajara during the FICG; and Morelia Lab, an event that first ran in October of 2005, with events split between Mexico City and Morelia, and which in subsequent years was run based of out Morelia during the FICM.

Specifically, each festival activity reflects its particular organization's mission, and even though they have different agendas, they all share a common goal of cultivating networks of support for filmmakers whose projects are at vulnerable stages, with the goal of helping filmmakers overcome barriers to film completion. Two major points of weakness for film projects are leading up to production, and—if a project gets off the ground—when a project is late in the production process. The lead-up to production is known in the film industry as the "development" stage. This is the stage when an idea begins to take shape as a viable film production, and elements such as story, production team, cast, and funding are lined up. Many ideas never become completed films because the projects either never get off the ground (due to lack of funding or not attracting other necessary support) or because while a film is in production the teams runs out of resources, or they encounter other hurdles that impede completion. The second major point of weakness is precisely this latter area: finishing funds and/or post-production support.[9] The case studies in the upcoming chapters are especially concerned with projects at the development or early production phases, while recognizing that post-production is of great significance and, further, that completed films still need funds and support if they are going to screen for audiences.

Those who own the rights to film ideas closely guard them. Many films in development never reach production, and less reach completion. Because of these two factors, even in the case of film adaptations from other sources (for example, books or true-life events), film projects in development are unlikely to be shared with anyone but a screenwriter and a few other core collaborators. This all contributes to the current situation in which projects at the development stage, along with the creative processes

[9] These observations are based on publications including Angus Finney's The International Film Business: A Market Guide Beyond Hollywood, and personal professional experience working in film festivals.

involved, are not well understood or studied by scholars.[10] Furthermore, these processes are also not usually well understood outside of practitioners working in the film industry at that level, and are typically undervalued by inexperienced filmmakers who often rush into production as quickly as they can (ref. Zimbrón Interview; Finney). During Mexico's industrial collapse, there was also a corresponding weakness at the level of production within the industry; professional, trained, invested producers were scarce. Key people associated with FICG, GIFF, and FICM decided to try to intervene, using the festivals themselves—which were already connected in key ways to industry resources—to develop a frameworks to back and support film production. The festivals' alliances with national and international government agencies, film funds, producers and distributors, and the organization of the industry activities themselves at the festivals, demonstrate commitment to a professionalization of the film production process in Mexico.

A challenge throughout this study has been to balance my personal professional endeavors with the reflection required by academic study. I was fortunate enough to by introduced to Sarah Hoch in 2004 in Guanajuato City in Guanajuato, Mexico, just prior to the first ever formal "pitching market" held in that country. In this context, a Pitching Market provides a space and time for "pitches." A "pitch" session refers to a series of meetings in which the representative or representatives of a selected film project have the opportunity to present their film to invited industry guests, for a pre-determined time per pitch. When I met and interviewed her in 2004, Hoch was both founder and director of the Comisión de Filmaciones del Estado de Guanajuato (The State Film Commission of Guanajuato) and the founder and director of Expresión en Corto, which would subsequently be reenvisioned as GIFF. Hoch invited me to volunteer as liaison and

[10] This is an observation expressed by many film producers who straddle working in the industry with working in academia, including but not limited to Carlos Taibo, whom I interviewed for this project. It is also reinforced by my personal professional experience, working with film producers through film festivals.

translator for visiting invitees to the International Pitching Market (IPM). After that first year, that I returned over a number of years in various capacities to assist with the annual IPM and, subsequently, with other events added in compliment to the IPM under the umbrella of an official "Industry" sector of the festival. During those years I watched as GIFF matured and grew, as its IPM has gone through changes, and as the festivals in Guadalajara and Morelia have also taken on activities specifically devoted to fostering production of Mexican films and co-production of films between Mexico and international partners. In addition to experience with EEC/GIFF, I began working in film programming at Cine Las Americas International Film Festival (CLAIFF) in Austin, Texas, in 2008, moving into the position of Festival Director for the 2015 edition. I was also hired by Fantastic Market at Fantastic Fest in Austin, Texas, as Market Coordinator when they launched in 2013 with a focus on Ibero-american film projects in development. As a result, once I began to formally study FICG, GIFF, and FICM, I have aimed to balance a multi-facted commitment to the critical examination of where my experiences intersect across festivals, filmmaking communities, and academia.

Because I undertook this study of film festivals and industry activities in Mexico after many years of professionally working in festivals on both sides of the US-Mexico border, I did not know when I started out at Expresión en Corto that my work in Guanajuato would ultimately provide me with a unique opportunity to reflect upon those experiences through academic inquiry. Being an outsider to a certain degree (an "American" studying film production in Mexico) and an insider on some levels (working alongside members of the festivals and industry representatives) presented a unique perspective from which to consider the questions at hand. I started this research project based on a belief that reflection and critical analysis of these festivals as industry agents was necessary. From professional experience, I know how quickly these annual events go

by, and how little time organizers can have to review past experiences in depth as they move on to plan the next year. That does not mean that there is no reflection on their part, because there is. Instead it means that reflection is, in practice, quite distinct from a longer-term analysis such as this one, which not only delves into one organization's trajectory over a period of a few years, but into three. Additionally, this project was designed to take into account perspectives on the festivals' industry activities beyond those of the internal coordinating teams, which is important to developing a framework for evaluating such events, because ultimately such evaluation must be tied to measures of success for the filmmakers who participate in the IPM, the Encuentro, or Morelia Lab.

As will be elaborated upon further in Chapter 3, the analytical framework I start with brings together three main concepts, as discussed by scholars Ragan Rhyne, Charles-Clemens Rüling, and Michael Curtin. The first is the model that Rhyne proposes, which discusses who the stakeholders are on the film festival circuit—that is, who is invested in this sector of cultural industries and for what purposes. It offers a lens for analyzing why and how festival organizers, cultural institutions, filmmakers, and other interested parties contribute to sustaining film festival operations, as well as ways in which festivals may compete with each other for scarce resources while attempting to remain relevant on the circuit (Rhyne 16-21). While Rhyne does not explicitly apply this model to festival industry activities (activities outside of the film festival's general program), it works by extension especially when we take into account Rüling's study. Rüling's application of the concept of "field-configuring events" (from an organization theory perspective) in assessing the Annecy International Animated Film Festival and Market, provides a framework through which one can evaluate a festival's development from founding to inclusion of industry activities, and consider to what extent the organization has positioned itself as an industry agent. In Rüling's model, an industry

agent or "industry actor" is one that recognized by members of a field as influencing the development and/or trajectory of that field (60-62). Rüling's concept also evokes the work of Pierre Bourdieu's theories on how fields in general are configured, specifically the ways in which people—in his work envisioned as a class struggle—compete to establish the legitimacy, value, and heirarchy of certain fields in the artistic sectors (ref. Bourdieu 1-73; Hilgers and Mangez). As an artistic field develops, its products and by extension the producers of those goods must negotiate markets that operate with their own laws, markets which by their nature seek to differentiate products along the lines of perceived cultural and commercial value (Bourdieu 112-114). As is explored further in upcoming Chapter 3 and the Conclusion Chapter 7, the notion of fields in this project is most applicable to theorizing the ways in which FICG, EEC/GIFF, and FICM have contributed to the cultivation of the field of professional producer in Mexico, and therefore to the greater landscape of an industrial infrastructure and increased output of Mexican cultural goods, i.e. nationally produced and co-produced films.

This ties directly into the third concept, Curtin's model of globalization and global capitals in media industry studies as outlined in "Thinking Globally." His work allows for an analysis of film festivals, festival stakeholders, and industry events that takes into account the ways in which cultural interchanges flow between centers of creativity. As will be addressed in more detail beginning in Chapter 3, Curtin's discussion of media flows between cultural creative centers or markets challenges simplistic notions of a dominance and subordinance in production and consumptions models. His work demonstrates ways in which cultural interchange in media industries flows in more than one direction, both within national borders and across international ones. Curtin's play on "media capital" is instructive. In its complexity, it refers to both (1) a location – the creative hub or magnet for media production and exhibition usually

with reference to a nation-state, and (2) the cultural or commercial goods that are produced and/or regulated by the media capital's markets and institutions and also creative goods that are produced and/or regulated by regional centers outside of the capitals. In brief, not all media capital is produced in media capitals, and cultural industries should be evaluated taking into account what Curtin describes as "trajectories of creative migration and forces of sociocultural variation" (117).

The complication of the notion of "media capital" is interesting and applicable to this study, in that Mexico City is certainly the dominant media hub in the nation, in terms of resources, infrastructure, and output. However, the festivals studied in depth for this project, FICG, GIFF, and FICM, are all located and operating outside the nation's capital. As will be explored in the chapters devoted to them, the three festivals are both affected by and affect national cinema trends; the projects they select feature national cinema both through "front of house" screenings and "behind the screens" activities; national and international films and attendees provide for possible cultural and capital exchanges through intersections at screenings and events. As we discuss in upcoming chapters, the festivals serve important roles as gatekeepers. The coordinating teams curate a select group of projects and filmmakers that they invite to participate in the industry activities. According to their stated missions, each festival's respective industry initiatives aim to bolster national film production; therefore, it is important not to forget their role in the selection of projects, their approval process for who can participate as an industry representative, and the overall design of their events.

This is important because decisions made at all levels by invested stakeholders affect very real lives, and production statistics on completed projects do not reveal such details. Behind every project that applies to the IPM, the Encuentro, or Morelia Lab, there are creative individuals want to see their film completed, but they lack resources to see it

through themselves. This explains why the present study's chapters on the festivals and festival initiatives include two case study films in each chapter. The interviews conducted with film representatives were designed to gather more nuanced information regarding the experience of filmmakers who have attended such events, and learn from their perspective as to the relative value of such participation towards their professional development. The following sections provide more initial introductions to the festivals, their industry initiatives, the films chosen for more in-depth focus, and the interviews conducted towards completing this original research project.

CASE STUDY AND INTERVIEW OVERVIEW

FICG, GIFF, and FICM were founded with an initial set of missions, which have since expanded to include the industry initiatives mentioned previously, the Encuentro, the IPM, and Morelia Lab. In the case of FICM and GIFF, the industry initiatives profiled are the longest running at each festival; at FICG there are a number of activities, with the Encuentro being the longest running at that festival that was specifically created to promote advancement of projects in development or preproduction. The primary years of the study are from 2003 (when Guadalajara created the Ibero-American Film Market) through 2011 (in order to have some time elapse for analytical perspective). All three initiatives' missions have expressed commitment to supporting works in development, or in need of production/post-production assistance, and the filmmakers behind the projects. Each film selected for in-depth profiling serves to illustrate different aspects of the film industry in Mexico, situating these projects in their corresponding national and global contexts.

The next section begins with an introduction to the festival in Guanajuato as well as its IPM, since the IPM was the first of the three profiled and studied initiatives to

launch, in July of 2004. The FICG and FICM introductions follow, as less than a year after the first IPM, the first Encuentro was held at the FICG in March 2005, and then in the fall of 2005, the first Morelia Lab ran at the FICM. Within each festival introduction, I describe the corresponding films selected as representative case studies: two films per festival. When selecting the films from each festival's initiative to investigate further, I looked for projects that were dissimilar in funding sources and narrative styles. Since I planned to profile only six films total for this project, I incorporated into the selection of films for case studies variables that I hypothesized could provide for some nuance in analysis. In upcoming sections in this chapter, I describe these initial considerations, and in the Chapters 4 through 6 devoted to the festivals, I elaborate on findings.

Festival Internacional de Cine Guanajuato (GIFF, Guanajuato International Film Festival)

As previously noted, GIFF formed in 1998 under the name "Festival Internacional de Cine 'Expresión en Corto'" (EEC). In 2011, prior to the fourteenth annual festival, the name was officially changed to Guanajuato International Film Festival (GIFF). During EEC's first years, its programming gained momentum as a film festival dedicated to showcasing Mexican short films, with screenings held in the city of San Miguel de Allende. Very quickly the program grew and by the third year the selection was international. EEC also opened the space for documentaries of all lengths, programming cutting-edge work from all over the world. In its promotion, the festival has highlighted that its mission was to provide exhibition space short films and documentaries, which have been traditionally marginalized at the box office (GIFF Website; Hoch Interviews). Over subsequent years, EEC/GIFF's program became increasingly international, while maintaining significant numbers of Mexican regional and national categories both in and out of competition. Workshops, master classes, and other parallel activities have

complimented the film selection over the years, with most film festival events remaining free and open to the public. In Chapter 4, the history of the festival is periodized into two primary stages: the years 1998 to 2003 which are prior to the launch of the International Pitching Market (IPM); and the years 2004 and following, during which the festival built on the IPM to create an official "Industry" area, with access limited to invited and accredited participants.

In 2004, festival leadership and partners coordinated and hosted the first ever Pitching Market in Mexico. That inaugural year of the IPM brought together 20 Mexican feature film projects to meet with producers, distributors, and exhibitors from Mexico, Germany, and the US, for private pitch sessions. Since then, to the time of this writing, the IPM has been held annually. While it has expanded substantially in its scope and mission, its primary commitment is still to promote the production and co-production of films in Mexico and with Mexican talent. In 2008, in addition to the official Mexican selection, the IPM began to incorporate projects in a "Cross-over" section. The "Cross-over" designation referred to projects that demonstrated potential for co-production between Mexico and the invited country of honor for the year. Another way the IPM has evolved is through GIFF's partnership to form the initiative "MexiCannes" with Cannes' Cinéfondation The Résidence du Festival, which also began in 2008.[11] In response to feedback that historically many of the participants in the IPM were not prepared to professionally pitch, GIFF has over the years included parallel activities such as panels, workshops, and an initiative called "Incubadora / Incubator" that purport to help train filmmakers in the skills of packaging and pitching their projects. To date, even with

[11] The term "MexiCannes" was derived from merging the words Mexican and Cannes. Each year starting in 2008, the festival in Guanajuato has invited all of the participants from the Cinéfondation The Résidence from the two sessions prior to July of that year. In addition to those that can attend from the Résidence (up to twelve total), EEC/GIFF has invited two Mexican filmmakers on scholarship to join the Cannes group.

added activities, the IPM and associated events have remained a central focus of the offerings for industry attendees.

The two films described in "GIFF Case Studies" represent projects selected from the first few years of the IPM, before IPM expansion into the "Cross-over" section and the partnership with Cannes. This is in part because I was interested in profiling films that actually reached completion after participation in the IPM. Since it often takes a few years for films to be completed, if they ever are, after their participation in the IPM, the pool of completed films to choose from was limited. I also excluded documentaries in favor of narratives, as the majority of films across all the festivals' initiatives are narrative films. Furthermore, I excluded the MexiCannes projects since the majority of the participants in that section of the IPM were already connected to the international European art cinema circuit prior to attending GIFF's pitching market. The films described below participated in the IPM early on in their development, and were subsequently completed. I also chose films that, based on initial data, revealed contrasting funding strategies, and represented distinct formal and narrative styles.

The first selected project, La Ticla / Amar a morir (Love 'Till Death) has a linear narrative, was developed with commercial outlets in mind, and was funded in part by FIDECINE and EFICINE. The second, La brújula la lleva el muerto (The Compass is Carried by the Dead Man) has a linear narrative, but it is heavily indebted to art cinema in tone and style, and while it did use EFICINE funding, the director-producer team had a difficult time securing other financiers. I expected that the two films' representatives would have correspondingly different experiences to share both in terms of their production histories, as well as on to what extent participation in the IPM was an integral part of the completion or subsequent life of the films. The interviews revealed some distinctions, but as the analyses in the upcoming Chapter 4 discussions will demonstrate,

the filmmakers' experiences turned out to be more parallel than I expected especially with respect to the IPM. In particular, each team benefitted more from the rigor of having to prepare for their meetings, than directly from the meetings themselves. A brief summary of each film follows here, and is elaborated upon in Chapter 4.

GIFF Case Studies

La Ticla, a project by writer/director/co-producer Fernando Lebrija, was one of seventeen projects selected to participate in the third annual International Pitching Market, in 2006. The film marked Lebrija's move from short films into feature films. It has since been completed and released under the title Amar a morir, as a Mexican/Colombian co-production involving Laguna Pictures, Cross Noise, Río Negro, Gussi Arte Cinema, and Videocine, with support from FIDECINE and EFICINE (México, CONACULTA and IMCINE, Cinema México 2008-2010 80). A commercially oriented drama set largely in the surfing milieu of the coasts of Michoacán, México, the film follows a rebellious young man trying to escape from his father's expectations of him. As heir to his father's banking empire, he feels trapped, and seeks adventure and love outside those confines; but his father does not back down easily, setting up the primary conflicts of the film. In 2009, Amar a morir participated in a few film festivals, including Santa Barbara Film Festival, FICG, and Los Angeles Latino International Film Festival (LALIFF), and enjoyed a decent theatrical run in Mexico with Box Office Mojo reporting total gross at just over $2.6 million USD as of May 2009 ("Amar a morir"). It was also released theatrically in Colombia and on television in Argentina. Sales agent FilmSharks holds world-wide rights, as of the time of this writing, and the film is available on DVD through DistriMax in the US.

The year after La Ticla / Amar a morir (Love 'Till Death) participated in the IPM, the project La brújula la lleva el muerto (The Compass Is Carried by the Dead Man) was one of ten films featured by the market; the number in the selection corresponding to the fact that in the year 2007 Expresión en Corto celebrated its 10th anniversary. This film also marked the director Arturo Pons' foray into feature films, after directing a few short films. Completed in 2011, produced by Ozcar Ramírez of Arte Mecánica as its principal production company, and funded in part by EFICINE, La brújula began a festival circuit run shortly thereafter. A dark comedy and satire, the film follows the journey of a young boy towards the US. His mother has died, and he is traveling north to find his brother. Along the way he meets an old man with a compass, who is driving a cart; the man dies, but remains in his seat and thus the two continue on their journey, picking up a number of odd travelers along the way. The group's constituents never are clear where they are going, and the film ends with them continuing their journey, not having crossed into the US nor reaching any other destination. La brújula premiered at the Los Angeles Film Festival (known as LA Film Fest), and also formed part of the Mexican First Feature selection at GIFF in 2012, where it was also picked up by Somos TV LLC for a limited Pay TV deal for the US and Puerto Rico. In 2013, the film received IMCINE funding support for a theatrical run in Mexico City and other regional centers in Mexico. While not as popular a splash as Amar a morir, the fact that La brújula was completed and circulated in some festival and theatrical venues was a success story in and of itself, and therefore drew my attention for futher research—in comparison not only to Amar a morir but also to other film projects from other industry selections in Guadalajara and Morelia.

Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara (FICG, Guadalajara International Film Festival)

When FICG first ran in 1986, it was called "Muestra de Cine Mexicano en Guadalajara" (Mexican Film Showcase in Guadalajara). As its original name indicates, FICG has been known principally for its long-time support of Mexican film across a variety of genres. In 2002, the festival catalog cover included "Guadalajara International Film Festival" after the original name; in 2004 the catalog cover read "Muestra de Cine Mexicano e Iberamericano Guadalajara Filmfest"; the following year, for the 20th edition, the name of the festival officially converted to its present-day iteration ("History"). In 2011, as the festival celebrated its 26th year, Iván Trujillo Bolio assumed direction of FICG; unlike GIFF and FICM, from its founding FICG has regularly undergone changes in leadership. Alongside the presentation of competition films, the festival has traditionally hosted a variety of parallel activities for attendees including themed film retrospectives, art and photography exhibits, concerts, and gala events. In Chapter 5, the history of this festival is discussed in two primary stages: the "Muestra" prior to the first Film Market in Guadalajara, covering the years 1986 to 2001; and the changes that have been occurring since 2002, as the Muestra formally transitioned into the Guadalajara International Film Festival (FICG) and developed an entire "Industria / Industry" area as a leader in the Ibero-American sector of world cinema.

FICG launched its industry area in 2003, with the Ibero-American Film Market. Its industry area has drawn substantial attention for this market, and it was for many years the leading market in the Americas for completed films from the Iberian Peninsula and Latin America seeking international sales, exhibition, and/or distribution deals.[12] In 2011,

[12] In recent years, Ventana Sur has arguably situated itself as the leading Ibero-American film market in the Western Hemisphere. Ventana Sur was established in 2009 in Buenos Aires, Argentina, as a joint effort between the Instituto Nacional de Cine y Artes Audiovisuales (National Institute for Film and Audiovisula Arts, or INCAA) and the Marché du Film of the Cannes Film Festival.

for example, the FICG video library boasted 1200 titles across the categories of feature films, documentaries, and short films (FICG26, Industria 7, 13-327). Within a couple years after inaugurating its Film Market, the festival added parallel activities dedicated to supporting films in pre-production through post-production. Two of the major ones are the Encuentro Iberoamericano de Coproducción Cinematográfico, or "the Encuentro" for short, and Guadalajara Construye.[13] This research focuses primarily on the Encuentro; the projects selected for Encuentro are in development or in preproduction and this is the phase of project of most interest to the present inquiry. The case study films analyzed in Chapter 6 were selected from the Encuentro's early editions.

In 2005, FICG held its first Encuentro. According to festival materials published for the fifth edition, the Encuentro was founded "to contribute to the development of the Mexican and Ibero-American film industry" and its goal "to bring the projects in development closer to international financing funds as well as to producers seeking co-productions" (FICG24, Industria 253). During the years covered by this study, after selecting projects to participate from all over Latin America and occasionally Spain, FICG invited the films' representatives to a series of sessions in which they presented their films in one-on-one meetings with industry attendees. The meetings were set individually based on the projects' profiles as well as those of the industry guests. Sometimes seminars were provided—for example in 2009, the Hubert Bals Fund (HBF), an important financier for international filmmakers including from Latin America—held a special presentation for the Coproduction Meeting (253). Additionally, the participating projects were eligible for awards including cash awards, post-production services at Estudios Churubusco Mexico, and jury-selected winners were offered accreditation to

[13] The name Guadalajara Construye translates directly as "Guadalajara Constructs" however, as with the Encuentro de Coproducción, it is most common to refer to Guadalajara Construye by its Spanish name, even amongst English speakers.

participate in the subsequent Marché du Film at Cannes. Another established program at FICG is Guadalajara Construye, which first ran in 2007 and included nine projects from Latin America. Annually since then, Guadalajara Construye has included an elite selection of films in post-production in need of closing final financing and are seeking theatrical release. The selected Guadalajara Construye films have screened in a special industry section, open to accredited industry professionals. The Encuentro and Guadalajara Construye are two of the more prominent complimentary activities that have been added to the FICG Market and Industry areas since their inception.

The two FICG case study films participated in the Encuentro, and were chosen for interviews as they represented two different trajectories beginning with film funding model, through subsequent production and distribution paths. As with the IPM projects, I also chose one film for its more classical narrative and form, and the other because it incorporated compelling art cinema style and narrative. The first film, Cinco días sin Nora (Nora's Will) was inspired by the personal experience of the writer/director, Mariana Chenillo, and applies a popular comedic sensibility and narrative style to the dark issue of suicide, successfully avoiding either broad comedy or heavy-handedness. The film Vaho (Becloud) is challenging structurally and stylistically while still telling a story from beginning to end—just not in that order. As might be expected given these distinctions, Cinco días was funded in part by FIDECINE and EFICINE, and Vaho in part by FOPROCINE, which was also why these two projects stood out to me for selection here. As I had with the IPM subjects, I anticipated that each filmmaker who attended the Encuentro would have quite different stories to share about what they gained through participation, and in these two cases, the distinctions between their accounts were more prominent. Chenillo secured a major producing partner; the team behind Vaho left the Encuentro without leads for co-production, but with some astute insight into the

power dynamics that shaped the relationship between project presenters and the people they were pitching to. The introductory summaries of Cinco días and Vaho that follow here are will be returned to and expanded upon with analysis in Chapter 5.

FICG Case Studies

In 2005, Cinco días sin Nora (Nora's Will) participated in the first Encuentro Iberoamericano de Coproducción Cinematográfico. A first feature written, directed and co-produced by Mariana Chenillo, the film was released in 2008, produced by Laura Imperiale of Cacerola Films, in co-production with FIDECINE and EFICINE. The film is a family comedy-drama that takes place in the days after the death of Nora. Since she died right before Passover, according to Jewish tradition, Nora cannot be buried for a few days, during which time her ex-husband, her children and her grandchildren, must face each other and reconcile their pasts. Cinco días enjoyed success on the festival circuit, including screening at FICM in 2008, LALIFF in 2009, and Mar del Plata in Argentina in 2009. It also garnered festival awards including Jury Awards for Best Director and Best First Film at LALIFF, and the Audience Award at Cine Las Americas, Austin, Texas in 2009.[14] The film won eight Ariel Awards (Mexican Academy Awards) and marked the first time a woman won best director. Theatrical releases include Mexico, Argentina, USA, Spain, S. Korea, Germany, and Brazil; DVD releases include USA, Argentina, and Switzerland. As its journey reflects, this is a film that achieved an admirable level of popular success as well as critical.

The film Vaho (Becloud) formed part of the 2007 Encuentro selection. This is another first feature, by writer/director/co-producer Alejandro Gerber Bicecci. Produced

[14] In full disclosure, I was employed as Film Program Associate for Cine Las Americas International Film Festival (CLAIFF) from the Fall of 2008 to Fall of 2014, and was responsible for programming the film Nora's Will in Austin for the 2009 edition of that festival. At the time of this writing, I serve as Festival Director for CLAIFF.

by Abril Schmucler of Albricias Producción in coordination with FOPROCINE and the HBF, the film was released in 2009. A challenging film formally and narratively, elliptically recalling three boys' memory of a traumatic event in their past, Vaho has been championed by art cinema aficionados. The film opened in FICM in 2009 and also played at the IFFR in 2010, as well as a few other international festivals. Global Film Initiative picked up rights to the film for the US and Canada, and circulated the film through its distribution channels. In comparison to Cinco días, Vaho represents a film whose success is measured almost exclusively by the attention it has achieved in international circles.

Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia (FICM, Morelia International Film Festival)

FICM is the youngest of these three film festivals, inaugurated in 2003. However, it is no less a force in the contemporary landscape. The festival's initial and continued mission is the promotion of Mexican film nationally and internationally, principally through fostering emerging talent. When it was founded, FICM showcased short films and documentary films, because "these are the genres that Mexican film students typically pursue first" (FICM, 5º Festival 10). Beginning with the 5th edition, FICM added a competitive category for directors' first or second feature films. Through the 9th edition in 2011, the festival stayed true to that mission of supporting Mexican produced and co-produced films, featuring the competition categories Michoacán Selection, Mexican Short Selection, Mexican Documentary Selection, and a Mexican Feature Selection of first or second films. Alongside the screenings of nationally produced films, the festival has hosted retrospectives and other parallel showcases, including international cinema selections. In a few short years, FICM has achieved impressive international visibility and alliances, for example with Cannes' International Critics' Week and the

Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences (AMPAS). Chapter 6 of this project elaborates upon the history of FICM, discussing its foundational years from 2003 to 2006 first, then its consolidation years from 2007 on.

Alongside the screenings of completed films, very shortly after its founding, FICM supported a new initiative aimed at supporting up and coming Mexican and other Ibero-American filmmakers. By its third edition in 2005, the festival's parallel activities included Morelia Lab, a combination of by-invitation-only workshops, seminars, and awards for producers that evolved substantially over the years. Initially, the projects selected were all from Mexico. The 2005 selection involved producers representing fiction feature film projects; in 2006, the qualifier "Doc" was added after "Morelia Lab" and all of the selected participants represented documentary feature film projects (FICM, Tercer Festival 202; Negrete). Since then, Morelia Lab and Morelia Lab Doc have alternated years. Further expanding its purview, beginning in 2007, both Morelia Labs for fiction and documentary have included Latin American selections. When this began, festival materials indicated the founders' enthusiasm about the possibilities of collaboration across Latin America, facilitated by spending time together in the workshops. Also in 2007, one of the workshop highlights was a session on how to pitch projects and prepare production portfolios, followed by a full day devoted to discussion of film distribution in Latin America (FICG, 5º Festival 278). All in all, through its evolution, the mission of Morelia Lab and Morelia Lab Doc has been to support industry development by mentoring filmmakers, through contact with established national and international industry guests, over a number of intense days.

The two FICM Case Studies are both narrative films, analogous in that regard with the previously discussed case studies from EEC/GIFF and FICG. As with the previously described case study films from the IPM and the Encuentro, the two Morelia

Lab projects were also selected for interviews for this study because of contrasts in their narrative style, technical form, and funding sources: Pastorela is a smart but broad comedy, intended by the producer/director team to reach popular audiences, and was funded in part by FIDECINE and EFICINE; by contrast, Fecha de caducidad (Expiration Date), a very dark comedy with unreliable narration and elliptical story-telling, had no luck with IMCINE funds, and instead pieced together funding largely from municipal and state sources in Guadalajara, Jalisco. Because of the organization of Morelia Lab as a training ground for producers, as opposed to a "pitching market" or series of "co-production meetings," I expected the Morelia Lab interviews to be the most comparable to each other, while distinct from the IPM or Encuentro interviews in terms of expectations and experience. This was borne out by the oral histories, in that the producers who attended Morelia Lab expressed a similar appreciation for the mentoring and networking opportunities available to them there as their primary take-aways. While I had not considered this prior to the interviews, this is also where the contrast between the Lab and the other two initiatives stood out most: IPM and Encuentro participants did not point to mentoring as a value, and rarely identified networking as an initial benefit of their attendance. The summaries of the two films presented here will be elaborated upon in Chapter 6, along with further analysis.

FICM Case Studies

In 2007, writer/director Emilio Portes' zany comedy Pastorela, was one of Morelia Lab's selections, represented by producer Rodrigo Herranz. Pastorela was one of two feature films that team Portes and Herranz were working on at the time; Conozca la cabeza de Juan Pérez (Meet the Head of Juan Perez) was released in 2008 and Pastorela in 2011. In between Morelia Lab and its release, Pastorela also participated in the 2010

edition of Guadalajara Construye. Pastorela is a comedy, with a central plot revolving around the staging of the annual Nativity play "Pastorela," a dramatic production well-known in Mexican and Mexican-American communities. The movie, as the play, is allegorical in nature with agents of "good" and "evil" pitted against one another. The film was produced principally by Producciones del Patrón in coordination with LaboDigitigal, Chemistry Cine, FIDECINE, and EFICINE. Pastorela was presented at FICM in 2011, then enjoyed a respectable box office run in Mexico (distributed by Videocine) but a weak one in the US (distributed by Pantelion Films, a division of Lionsgate). Despite being released at the end of the year on November 11th, 2011, the film came in fifth in overall box office for Mexican films at just over $3 million USD (México, IMCINE, Anuario 2011 32, 40). It won seven Mexican Ariels in 2012, including Best Film, Best Director, and Best Script. Although it played in the Vancouver Latin American Film Festival September of 2012, the film has not really seen wide distribution through festivals. It is currently available on DVD from Lionsgate.

Two years after Herranz went through Morelia Lab, Karla Uribe González attended Morelia Lab with the project Fecha de caducidad (Expiration Date). The film was a first feature that had long been in development by writer/director Kenya Márquez; besides the general difficulty she found finding funding backers for the project, Márquez also served as director of FICG from 2002-2005 which understandably absorbed a great deal of her time and attention. Fecha de caducidad is concerned with a mother's investigation into the disappearance and death of her son, but nothing is what it seems. Layers of narration each favor a different point of view, complicating any single interpretation of what happened or whose perception of the situation is most accurate. From the beginning of working on the script in 2000, Márquez experienced difficulty with people not understanding the story's tone from the written version, and so when she

returned to the project after FICG, she proposed shooting the first ten minutes of the script as a proof of concept. The resulting product became the short film "Señas particulares" ("Distinguishing Features," 2007), which was well received on the festival circuit and was even nominated for an Ariel in 2008. However, the short film's success did not seem to help in attracting coproducing partners to the feature. After Uribe's application and acceptance to the Lab in 2009, it would still take two more years for the feature to be completed. It premiered at FICM in 2011, winning the Audience Award, and then went on to additional festival and critical acclaim. The film has yet to break out of that circuit into international markets, however, even with the backing of Latinofusión as sales agent.

PRIMARY RESEARCH METHODS AND SOURCES

The preceding overviews of the three festivals and the six case study films are expanded upon in Chapters 4 through 6. Prior to this, Chapter 2 provides an overview of (1) Mexican film history. Subsequently, Chapter 3 covers a review of scholarship in related areas, including (1) Hollywood's industrial models, (2) auteur / art cinema industrial trends and their relationship with film festival circuits, (3) the burgeoning discipline of film festival studies, and (4) the establishment of festival initiatives aimed at funding and capacity-building, and predominantly targeted towards independent and/or minority projects and filmmakers. These were the primary fields that influenced my research interests and plan, and subsequently the study of the chosen festivals and case study films.

Scholarship is weak or missing entirely, especially in English, on Mexican film festivals and on the programs described above—EEC/GIFF's IPM, FICG's Encuentro, and FICM's Morelia Lab. Thus the chapters devoted to them in this study are intended to

address the gaps. The histories and analyses presented in Chapters 4 through 6 benefitted greatly from primary source materials, including access to limited release publications produced by festival organizers, and a number of unpublished working documents internal to festival operations. In addition to these, I relied heavily on news articles, industry trade publications, and similar sources that reported on the events either as they were happening or subsequently. Finally, I conducted a series of interviews with some of the key figures in Mexican film festivals and film production during the early 2000s.

In the early 2000s, IMCINE, EEC/GIFF, FICG, and FICM turned attention towards the state of national film production, and invested resources in funds and other programs to try to boost production in quantity and quality. For this project, I reached out to a number of individuals who could provide background and analysis based on their professional experiences. Interviews with representatives from government institutions and the festivals formed a substantial portion of the primary source material. Representatives specifically interviewed for their experience at IMCINE included Víctor Ugalde—former Director of FIDECINE, a major player in the design and implementation of EFICINE 226, and Director of Mexico's Directors' Association as of the time of this writing—and Hugo Villa Smythe, Director of Cinematographic Production at IMCINE, 2007-2013. Other interviewees have overlaps with IMCINE, for example, Carlos Taibo, whom I contacted to interview primarily for his involvement with Morelia Lab, had also worked at IMCINE as Director of Production from early 2005 to mid 2007.

Other interviews focused attention on festival directors and coordinators of the various festival initiatives, especially towards filling in some of the historical record, as well as gaining insight into what has been at stake for them as professionals working in these areas of the film industry in Mexico. In terms of festival directors, interviews were conducted with: Kenya Márquez, Director of FICG, 2002-2005; Sarah Hoch Delong,

Founder and Director of EEC/GIFF; and Daniela Michel, Co-founder and Director of FICM. Representatives of each of the festival initiatives were also interviewed: (1) José Antonio Elo, Coordinator of first two IPM in Guanajuato; (2) Andrea Stavenhagen, integral to FICG's Industry area including the Encuentro from 2005 through 2013, Co-director of Morelia Lab, and Co-coordinator of the third IPM at EEC; and (3) the aforementioned Carlos Taibo, Co-director of Morelia Lab from inception through the time of this writing.

The final set of interviews were of the principal filmmakers (both director and producer where possible) behind the six case study films described above. From the beginning of this project, I envisioned these types of interviews as the core subject of inquiry, as a way to gather qualitative information that could lead in the future to more quantitative analysis, when more data points are able to be collected. Through the interviews I was interested in hearing from the filmmakers as to whether their participation in the IPM, Encuentro, or Lab, was of any value to them. Ideas of value are multi-faceted and subjective, and a model for assessing "value" in these cases had yet to be developed. Therefore the interviews were open-ended, with inquiries into what they had expected to achieve by attending, followed by asking them to reflect on any benefits their participation afforded them, both in the short term and the longer term. The long term goal of such research would be to identify what types of projects at what stages of development might best benefit from the resources available to them at the different initiatives. The interviews conducted with filmmakers for this project laid the groundwork for future research and analysis along these lines, and included: director Fernando Lebrija of Amar a morir; director Arturo Pons and producer Ozcar Ramírez of La brújula la lleva el muerto; director Mariana Chenillo and producer Laura Imperiale of Cinco días sin Nora; director Alejandro Gerber Bicecci and producer Abril Schmucler of

Vaho; producer Rodrigo Herranz Fanjul of Pastorela; director Kenya Márquez and Producer Karla Uribe González of Fecha de caducidad.

Compiling, contextualizing, and analyzing these first-hand accounts constitutes an original contribution to the fields of Mexican Cinema, International Production and Co-Production, and Film Festival studies.

CONCLUSION

The scope of this research investigation, primarily the years 2000-2011, was influenced by a few key historical markers, including that in 2000, Vicente Fox was elected President of Mexico. This marked the first time that the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (the Institutional Revolutionary Party or PRI) or its antecedent versions did not hold the presidency the party was founded in 1929. Both Fox and his successor, Felipe Calderón, were members of the Partido Acción Nacional (the National Action Party, or PAN). The resurgence of numbers in Mexican film production took place during their tenure, as institutions and legislation continued to promote diversification in funding through governing committees and private investment, but, as will be elaborated upon in Chapter 2, production resurgence should not be interpreted as correlating directly to Fox's or Calderón's initiatives. In fact, Fox's strong neoliberal tendencies were curtailed by backlashes from industry leaders, who successfully lobbied to restructure and expand the reach of state resources in support of film production. Under Calderón, funds were restructured and new initiatives created, not only for production but also, toward the end of his term, exhibition support. It was during these presidential terms that FICG, GIFF, and FICM all threw their resources into the ring with the aim of bolstering Mexican film production.

In December of 2012, the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (Institutional Revolutionary Party, or PRI) took power again under President Enrique Peña Nieto. Administrative decisions regarding funding for institutions as well as changes in institutional appointments began quickly to affect the film industry. While the Peña Nieto years have remained largely outside the scope of this investigation, the return of the PRI to the presidency was influential in my desire to take on this project at the time that I did, and to try to capture some of the energy, institutional memory, and history of the Mexican film industry of the early 2000s from the perspective of some of those who were invested in it. What I had observed—on the ground myself beginning in Guanajuato in 2004, and shortly thereafter in other contexts—was a concerted effort by a number of festivals and institutions to foster existing networks of support and create new ones in national and international contexts for members of the Mexican film industry. The energy was there, but the Mexican industry needed to mature in many ways, including networking, but also in cultivating talent, especially in the area of professional film producers.

Fostering national networks, expanding alliances with international institutions, providing opportunities for filmmakers to connect to funding and support structures, and building industrial infrastructure within which filmmakers can work in a thriving industry as full-time professionals, all seem great ideas to rebuild an industry and insure that at least some filmmakers are ready to ride out a downturn in government support (should the Mexican system collapse again). The fact that this dissertation set out to evaluate recent history, and current phenomena within film festival trends, presented its greatest challenge as well as its strongest argument for relevance. This introductory chapter's overview of some recent trends in the Mexican industry and film festivals—including the primary objects of historicization and study, the IPM, the Encuentro, and Morelia Lab—

is elaborated upon in the following chapter. The explosion in the number of film festivals over the past decades, as well as the rise of digital exhibition has resulted in more and more need for festivals to distinguish themselves from the pack through various means, one of which has been to explore what I have designated as "behind the screens" activities supporting new talent and/or filmmakers from marginalized communities in the global film industries.

Mexican film festivals, and their work supporting national filmmakers, cannot be analyzed without reference to their situation within national and international industrial frameworks, which Chapter 2 will discuss. Following this, Chapter 3 elaborates on historical and theoretical models related to this project's inquiries. Chapters 4, 5, and 6 are devoted to each regional festival and the highlighted initiative in the order of the initiative's launch: the IPM at EEC/GIFF in the summer of 2004; the Encuentro at FICG in spring of 2005; and Morelia Lab at FICM in the fall of 2005. Taken together, the chapters consider the complex nature of the relationship of film festivals with other areas of the film industry, in increasingly interconnected and competing ways, along the spectrum of film development through film distribution. The three film festivals in Mexico that led the way in "behind the screens" support for filmmakers did so in an environment where national film production was at an especially vulnerable point. As organizations that were founded with missions to exhibition of Mexican cinema, and in the contemporary scene where festivals must evolve in order to survive themselves, these festivals responded by advancing initiatives that they hoped would bolster film production, while also advancing their own festivals as leaders on the festival circuit. The next chapter sets the background for this environment by delving into Mexican film history.

Chapter 2: Mexican Film History

> To the well-known history of Mexican Cinema's Golden Age, to its symbolism, to the faces and artists that led the way, the past 25 years have seen the addition of innumerable new creative forces. [...] There remain, of course, many challenges to face and many tasks to attend to.
> - Marina Stavenhagen, Director of IMCINE, 2007-2012[15]

Mexico's cinema history traces its roots to the late 1800s, its 101st birthday coinciding with 1997, the infamous year that the Instituto Mexicano de la Cinematografía (the Mexican Cinematographic Institute, or IMCINE), labeled as "Colapso industrial" or "Industrial collapse" in its historical timeline (México, IMCINE, Línea de tiempo). Film festivals, such as those the center of this investigation, are a recent addition to the history of Mexican cinema. Only one of the three was even founded prior to 1997: the Guadalajara International Film Festival (FICG, Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara), which debuted in 1986 as a festival devoted to showcasing Mexican cinema and cineastes. The Guanajuato International Film Festival (GIFF) was founded in 1998, as a short film festival "Expresión en Corto,"[16] and it gained momentum as a short film and documentary film festival, featuring Mexican films and filmmakers among its principal showcases. The Morelia International Film Festival (FICM, Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia) is the youngest of the three festivals, emerging on the scene in 2003 and prides itself on an annual festival anchored in Mexican cinema, with all of its competitive sections and many of its retrospectives devoted to Mexican films. Each has established a role on the circuit of Mexican film exhibition. Additionally in the 2000s, each festival began to expand its influence in other ways within the industry—of most interest to this project, in the areas of support for film producers through special

---

[15] Marina Stavenhagen, "Prólogo," Múltiples rostros (Mexico City: IMCINE, 2009) 9. Translated from Spanish.
[16] See Chapter 1, note 4.

initiatives: the International Pitching Market (IPM) in Guanajuato in summer of 2004, the Encuentro de Coproducción in Guadalajara in spring of 2005,[17] and Morelia Lab in Morelia in the fall of 2005.

The motivations for each festival's founding and evolving mission, from exhibiting films through more recent initiatives "behind the screens," were grounded in reactions to trends in Mexican cinema and corresponding failures and successes on the part of film institutions to respond especially in times of hardship. As previewed in Chapter 1, Mexican film production has gone through a number of cycles of renovation and decline since its inception. Prior to delving into the upcoming chapters that cover international film industry contexts, film festival trends, and theoretical models (Chapter 3), as well as more about GIFF and the IPM in Guanajuato (Chapter 4), FICG and the Encuentro in Guadalajara (Chapter 5), and FICM and the Lab in Morelia (Chapter 6), this chapter is dedicated to outlining the history of Mexican cinema. In order to better understand just how significant the festivals have been to Mexican filmmakers and the film industry in the late 1990s and early 2000s, it is important to consider how that industry and its institutions operated prior to then, and also what the general landscape has been in recent years for national films and filmmakers.

MEXICAN FILM HISTORY

Mexican cinema, like other national cinemas, must be studied from within its borders as well as in comparative context with international cinema including Hollywood. In order to get started, we turn to historical investigations by Eduardo de la Vega Alfonso, Tomás Pérez Turrent, Charles Ramirez Berg, and Carl J. Mora, which

[17] See Chapter 1, note 8.

facilitate this chapter's discussion of Mexican cinema history, organized into the following general time periods:[18]

- 1896 to late 1920s: Silent Film Era
- 1930s to late 1950s: Sound Cinema, the Mexican Golden Age, and Industry Consolidation
- 1960s to early 1990s: Decline, Renovation, Commercialism, Collapse
- 1990s to early 21st Century: Globalization and New Strategies

Throughout the history of cinema in Mexico, filmmakers have experienced ups and downs with respect to output, national success, and international recognition. The principal considerations may be summarized as: (1) the power of the state and the extent to which it has been invested in supporting filmmakers; (2) the influence of Hollywood and trends in US cinema; and (3) the resonance of European film movements, especially art cinema as it has developed from the 1960s to the present.

1896 to late 1920s: Silent Film Era

Mexican cinema begins in the late 1800s, in conjunction with other major defining national events, especially the end of Porfirio Díaz' rule of Mexico (1876-1910),

---

[18] My organization is a consolidation of periods proposed by the named authors. In Vega Alfaro's article "Origins, Development and Crisis of the Sound Cinema (1929-64)," he proposes three periods for his subset of history: 1929-1937 - First Sound Films and Preindustrial Sound Cinema; 1938-1953 - Birth, Peak, and Consolidation of the Film Industry; 1955-1964 - The Ghost of Crisis.

Tómas Pérez Turrent picks up the historical thread in his article "Crises and Renovations (1965-1991)" and runs through the decades, essentially breaking down this historical period by presidential terms.

Charles Ramirez Berg focuses largely on the era named in the title of his book Cinema of Solitude: A Critical Study of Mexican Film, 1967-1983, but does break down earlier historical periods roughly into: 1896 to late 1920s - Silent Era, fits and starts of industry, then decline; 1930s to late 1950s - Sound Cinema into Golden Age; 1960s - Collapse into formula.

Carl J. Mora's book Mexican Cinema: Reflections of a Society, 1896-2004, 3rd edition, which is the most comprehensive of these selections, breaks his chapters into the following years: 1896-1929 - The Silent Film Era; 1930-1939 - The Coming of Sound; 1940-1946 - War and Growth of a Major Industry; 1947-1959 - "Golden Age," Crisis, and Retrenchment; 1960-1980 - Decline, Renovation, and the Return of Commercialism; 1981-1989 - "To Rebuild a Ruined Cinema in a Ruined Country"; 1990-2004 - Globalization and New Paths.

and subsequently the years of the Mexican Revolution. Towards the end of the Revolution, the Mexican government started to recognize the power of cinema to shape public opinion, and began to censor film along both morally and politically inspired agendas. In the late 1910s, two changes occurred that affected the course of Mexican cinema's subsequent production: Mexican studios started appearing; and production shifted to developing a national fiction cinema in an attempt to compete with the already influential Hollywood cinema. Early films such as 1810 o los libertadores de México (1810 or the Liberators of Mexico, 1916, Prod. Cimar), En defensa propia (In Self Defense, 1917, Prod. Azteca Films), drew especially from historical themes, literature, and Italian films; the popular film El automóvil gris (The Grey Automobile, 1919, Prod. and Dir. Enrique Rosas), combined documentary footage with reenactments based on sensational real events.

By the 1920s, the US industry was a definitively dominant producer and exporter of films not only to Mexico but elsewhere internationally. Attempts to develop a home-grown narrative cinema in Mexico struggled from production to attracting a national audience. As noted by Mora, "The United States was producing between five hundred and seven hundred features a year by the early 1920s, a gargantuan industry that was backed up by aggressive marketing organization throughout the world" (Mexican Cinema 1896-2004 22). Mexico's studios, by contrast, produced fourteen films in 1919, two in 1923, and from what records are available, none in 1924, followed by seven in 1925 (22). In addition to this, the star system of Hollywood drew Mexican talent northwards across the border, including Lupe Vélez, Gilbert Roland, Ramón Novarro, and most famously Dolores del Río whose career spanned decades across silent film and "talkies." The fact that Mexican-based studios and filmmakers had emerged, though, was key to later industry development.

1930s to late 1950s: Sound Cinema, the Mexican Golden Age, and Industry Consolidation

In the 1930s, the studios entered a more mature stage of development than they had seen before. Studios employed teams who worked on projects together, and producers led the way, shaping artistic and acting talent. While Hollywood worked diligently to make export-oriented product for Latin America, Latin America was largely resistant to Hollywood Spanish-language films, or Hollywood subtitled or dubbed film exports. This opened a space for Mexican production to experiement with Spanish-language sound cinema that would be more accessible to national and international audiences. A return of state support to cinema, as well as some commercially successful films, allowed Mexican studios such as Nacional Productora, México-Films, and Industrial Cinematográfica to step up production. Mexican genres began to emerge, which ended up being successful as nationalistic films as well as popular throughout Latin America. Two films in particular were produced that would shape national cinema for decades. La mujer del puerto (The Woman of the Port, 1933, Dir. Arcady Boytler) initiated an obsession in national cinema with prostitutes and cabaret life, and Allá en el Rancho Grande (Out at the Big Ranch, 1936, Dir. Fernando de Fuentes) spawned the immensely popular "comedia ranchera" cycles of films (Vega Alfaro 82; López 7-8).

Heading into the 1940s, Mexico was entering what is now termed its classical era, or its Golden Age (in Spanish, "Cine de Oro"). On the heels of some successful films and increased production overall by the studios, Mexico was poised to take advantage of an alliance with the US that allowed it to develop its industry further. Mexico was especially strategic in the US's goals for defeating the Axis countries, and a primary focus of US President Roosevelt's Good Neighbor policy during World War II. In exchange for military cooperation and badly needed materials for the US war effort, the US aided

Mexico as a nation in many ways. This included supporting its film industry, providing essential film stock as well as other technological aid. At the same time, the Mexican state invested in the national cinema, including founding the Banco Nacional Cinematográfico in 1942, resulting in a situation where Mexico quickly overtook Argentina as the dominant Spanish-language cinema of the Americas. Even as the film industry was moving towards standardization, early on in the 1940s there was a surge of creativity within the surge in production levels (Fein, "From Collaboration" 129-30; J. King 36). One team that stands out is Emilio "El Indio" Fernández and Gabriel Figueroa, the former as director and the latter as cinematographer, through drawing on European influences were inspired to create their own nationalistic style. Together they adapted the medium to achieve their visions, creating such classics as Flor silvestre (Wild Flower, 1943) and María Candelaria (1943), and launching Dolores del Río's Mexican film career at the same time. María Félix was also gaining recognition thanks to director Fernando de Fuentes, and films featuring the comedians Cantinflas and Tin Tan were rising in popularity (Monsiváis; J. King 47-51).

The Mexican "Golden Age" (late 1930s through the late 1950s) was buoyed by investments in the early years of the 1940s; however by the mid 1940s and the end of World War II, US support was withdrawn. Formulaic films dominated the Mexican box office as national studios were unwilling to take risks. Unions had also been established by the mid 1940s, imposing another layer of stability to the industry, but also serving to choke out the entrance of innovative talent to the ranks of film production. A strict apprentice-based system fed the studio ranks. Even someone as innovative and respected as Luis Buñuel, whose Mexican works including El gran calavera (The Great Madcap, 1949) and Los olvidados (The Young and the Damned, 1950) were successful, found it difficult to work in Mexico, and it was not until the 1960s that Mexican directors began

to emulate him. By the mid to late 1950s, the Banco Cinematográfico and the Studios were more concerned with quickly reproducing formula films than with cultivating artistic talent. The market for Mexican films at home and throughout Latin America had also dropped off.

1960s to early 1990s: Decline, Renovation, Commercialism, Collapse

The next historical period is one in which the direct influence of presidential involvement in the film industry, as part of national agendas, becomes increasingly visible and significant to the ups and downs of Mexican cinema. In Mexico, since 1934, presidents have been elected to serve one six-year term, called a "sexenio." While regional elections and appointments have certainly influenced presidential actions from bottom to top, it is difficult to stress just how significant the presidential turnover has been every six years for all non-elected officials, especially but not exclusively when accompanied by a change in the presidential party affiliation. By institutional design, anyone serving at the pleasure of the president is subject to change when the presidency changes; any institution created by a president is subject to dismantling or overhaul. On a corresponding scale, regional elections also affect drastically regional governmental offices. Whether major industries including the film industry have been nationalized or privatized, and how industries have been funded or subsidized (or not) by the government, has changed, sometimes drastically, on the heels of every presidential election.

What characterizes the decades of the 1960s through 1980s in comparison with previous decades are efforts on competing fronts to bolster film production in Mexico, sometimes for better but often for worse in terms of sustained film industry output. Entering the 1960s, Mexico as a nation was experiencing internal crises, with riots and

protests against government policies. Conflict between authority and opposition culminated in a deadly confrontation between police and protestors in the Mexican area of Tlatelolco in 1968. Despite the volatile political environment, the opportunity for industry revitalization was there, especially if the context of cinema throughout Latin America is considered: cinema was being linked to social change, and filmmakers were looking for ways to make films with intellectual commitment.

An experimental film competition in the mid-1960s saw some impressive work, including La fórmula secreta (The Secret Formula, 1965, Dir. Rubén Gómez) and En este pueblo no hay ladrones (In this Town there Are no Thieves, 1965, Dir. Alberto Isaac). Another attempt to organize an experimental film competition a few years later was less remarkable. Overall, the results of such contests were mixed. However, other filmmakers of eventual importance in the industry emerged, including Arturo Ripstein and Alejandro Jodorowsky. Filmmakers working outside the studios, even if they could find the means to make films, did not have access to distribution and exhibition networks, and were increasingly frustrated by political censorship. By the end of the 1960s, despite evident intent and desire to bolster filmmaking infrastructure—like the formation of a department dedicated to film studies at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (National Autonomous University of Mexico, or UNAM) in 1959, the establishment of a film journal Cuadernos de Cine at the UNAM in 1962, and the founding of the nation's first Film School (the Centro Universitario de Estudios Cinematográficos, or CUEC) at the UNAM in 1963—a fundamental lack of funds, political upheavals, and weak infrastructure meant that few films and filmmakers stood out, and revitalization was still minimal (Pineda and Paranaguá 42-44; Mora, Mexican Cinema 1896-1980 101-13).

Then Luis Echeverría Alvarez became president in 1970 and things started to look up for a new national cinema of quality. The president was openly in favor of fostering

new voices in cinema with whatever means the state had at its disposal. He nationalized funding and appointed his brother Rodolfo Echeverría as the head of the Banco Cinematográfico. Under state direction and through state-created production companies,[19] Luis Echeverría's initiatives eventually closed off funding to established old-line production companies, and he pressured national exhibitors to screen Mexican films. This mitigated the private producers' power in the national industry, but state-supported production still lagged at first because there were not really people in place to step up and make films in the absence of the old guard, and up-and-coming filmmakers were not at first trusting that the "opening" of cinema was for real. But some filmmakers who latched on to the ideas of an auteur cinema and cinema as personal expression, did access the state aid and some even used their freedom to explore previously censored, controversial themes in cinema. Some of the stand-out directors include Paul Leduc, Arturo Ripstein, Jaime Humberto Hermosillo, and Felipe Cazals. Popular comedies and melodramas persisted, but were balanced as it were with more openness by filmmakers to address social issues across the board. Films began to resonate both within and outside of Mexico, including Cazals' Canoa (1975) which won the Special Jury Prize at the Berlin Film Festival in 1976. The state also overtly worked to ensure training of future filmmakers, establishing a second film school in Mexico City, the Centro de Capacitación

[19] The three production companies established were: the Corporación Nacional Cinematográfica (CONACINE), October 1974; the Corporación Nacional Cinematográfica de Trabajadores y Estado I (CONACITE I), June 1975; and the Corporación Nacional Cinematográfica de Trabajadores y Estado II (CONACITE II), May 1975 (Mora, Mexican Cinema 1896-1980 115). CONACITE I was dissolved and CONACITE II was defunded under the López Portillo administration (Mora, Mexican Cinema 1896-2004 140; Maciel, "Cinema and the State" 210); Salinas de Gortari's administration dissolved CONACINE and CONACITE II in the early 1990s (Pérez Turrent 111).

Cinematográfica (CCC)[20] in 1975 (Pineda and Paranaguá 48-49; Maciel 201-207; Berg 46-50).

As Berg documents in Cinema of Solitude, under the Echeverría administration, filmmakers found the space to expose those contradictions within the national ideology associated with the viability of the post-Revolutionary patriarchal society. Leftist politics and a desire to invigorate Mexican cinema inspired many filmmakers; they found themselves motivated by the volatile social movements, the political engagement, and the intellectual trends established by activists within and outside of the university system in the 1960s. The archetypical roles of women and men were interrogated and deconstructed, for example in films La pasión según Berenice (Passion According to Berenice, 1975, Dir. Jaime Humberto Hermosillo) and El castillo de la pureza (The Castle of Purity, 1972, Dir. Arturo Ripstein), where old traditions were exposed as no longer viable, but new solutions and identities have yet to be found. The questions and themes about social change extend beyond male/female dynamics, and into questions of power and use of force against marginalized peoples in the past and present formation of the state. Films including La casta divina (The Divine Caste, 1976, Dir. Julián Pastor) and Canoa are among many significant films that brought these issues into the forefront of Mexican cinema (Berg).

The momentum in Mexican cinema production where filmmakers began to feel some freedom to experiment with content (and to a lesser extent form) was just getting going when the Echeverría administration ended. The subsequent administration led by President José López Portillo did its best to shut down any attempts at culturally critical or auteur cinema, prioritizing profit over freedom of expression or any other measure of

[20] Literally translated along the lines of the Center for Film Training, the school's name "Centro de Capacitación Cinematográfica" is rarely translated into English and is referred to as "el CCC" or "the CCC."

success. With an eye towards reinvigorating Mexican commercial cinema, the administration re-privatized the industry, and the President named his sister Margarita López Portillo the head of the government branch overseeing communications industries (as they existed then—Radio, Television, and Film). Notoriously ideologically driven as well, the government supported only films that fit its idea of family, educational, and entertainment cinema. Its policies also made it difficult for the fruit of the previous administration's directors to find distribution outlets. As noted above, under the Echeverría administration, the Banco Cinematográfico had marginalized private production and made moves to fund or co-fund projects they deemed creative or innovative, culturally relevant and of quality in the veins of auteur cinema (Pérez Turrant 100-101). The López Portillo administration not only reversed the artistic course set by President Echverría, it also initiated and oversaw the liquidation of the Banco Cinematográfico—but not until after redirecting its attention to supporting the private producers who had been denied credit during the previous sexenio (Berg, Cinema of Solitude 51).

Despite this reversal in state priorities, a few very impressive films emerged in the late 1970s, in the wake of the López Portillo administration, having been supported but unfinished until the new administration took office. This work included films by such auteurs as Ripstein, Cazals, and Hermosillo, who actually then managed to survive the downturn with some state backing and without entirely giving up cinema production. In fact, many of their contemporaries were absorbed into the TV industry, while others turned to different enterprises entirely. Despite its restricted stance on what the state would support, the López Portillo regime fostered certain veins of cinema and supported a surprising number of talented filmmakers, including the director-writer team Alfredo Gurrola and Jorge Patiño—noted for Llámanme Mike (Call Me Mike, 1979), Días de

combate (Days of Combat, 1982), and Cosa fácil (Easy Thing, 1982)—while specifically repressing others whose work was deemed elitist. In the meantime, private producers returned to old habits and made films based on the genres that had worked in the past, especially melodramas. While programs based on popular genres and formula were successful on television, films derived from these tropes (typical telenovela stories, urban dramedy, and updated "cabaretera" stories) no longer drew audiences to the theater. By the end of López Portillo's tenure, filmmaking in Mexico had been almost entirely turned over to private producers cranking out films that were neither artistic nor culturally nor commercially viable. Also devastating to Mexican national cinema history was a fire at the Cineteca Nacional (the National Film Archive) in the early 1980s, destroying much of their cinematic heritage (Pérez Turrent, "Crises" 104-109).

By the 1980s, funding for cinema was in dire straits—production numbers declined and cinemas closed. Mexican cinema had yet to reclaim a national audience, much less attract substantial international attention. When Miguel de la Madrid became president (1982), the state again took interest in developing a cinema for its directors' visions, and in 1983 he founded the Instituto Mexicano de la Cinematografía (IMCINE) under the direction of Alberto Isaac. Progress along these lines was not immediate, however, because between official corruption and the economic crises that diverted funds away from production, cinema projects had a hard time getting off the ground. Nonetheless, attempts were made to push Mexican cinema into contention on the international scene, and when there were funds, there was support for cinema that aspired to circulate on the international circuit as cinema of artistic quality, for example Ripstein's El imperio de la fortuna (The Empire of Fortune, 1985) and Cazals' El tres de copas (The Three of Spades, 1986).

The de la Madrid administration appointed Enrique Soto Izquierdo director of IMCINE in 1986, and Mexican filmmakers stood to benefit from both the Plan de Renovación Cinematográfica (Cinema Renovation Plan) and the establishment of the Fondo de Fomento a la Calidad Cinematográfica (a Development Fund for Quality Cinema, the FFCC) which were put in place in the late 1980s (México, Línea de tiempo). While traditional producer systems did continue creating relatively commercial films—for example "exploitation" film cycles, "border" and "narco" films, and "sexycomedias"—organizations such as IMCINE and the CCC maintained support for a more committed culturally-oriented sector of films. This sector was one in which filmmakers had more control over their work, i.e. they were largely in charge of their projects. The chronic lack of funding actually available, though, meant that acting as their own co-producer (for better or worse) was also part of the package. The result was uneven work, with some standout films as flagships for cinema of quality and meaning, for example Paul Ledúc's Frida, naturaleza viva (Frida, 1985), which cleaned up at the Mexican Ariel Awards and garnered international acclaim, and Hermosillo's Doña Herlinda y su hijo (Doña Herlinda and Her Son, 1985) which was more of a sleeper in Mexico at first, but which later became a cult hit with gay and queer communities. Significantly, part of the support put in place during the de la Madrid administration included exhibition outlets. This in turn inspired better production opportunities because filmmakers had some viable options through which to predict some return on their investments (Mora, Mexican Cinema 1896-2004 150-59; Pérez Turrent, "Crises and Renovations" 108-11; Maciel 211-12).

Just as the de la Madrid efforts were starting to pay off in terms of film productions, his administration ended; Carlos Salinas de Gortari took over the presidency in 1988 and the state reduced its direct role in production, and reprivatized national

industries from banking to cinema. In the wake of these changes, some key production companies, studios, and theater chains folded, were sold, or were forcibly closed—all of which was devastating to the production and exhibition infrastructures of the country. Salinas created the Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes (The National Council for Culture and the Arts, or CONACULTA) in December of 1988. IMCINE, still a fledgling entity struggling under revolving leadership to establish a clear voice and mission, was brought under CONACULTA's purview; the relationship was tenuous and IMCINE's break from its previous governmental oversight committee for Radio, Television, and Film (Dirección General de Radio, Televisión y Cinematografía) was contentious even after the official directive came down. Despite these turnovers, what happened at the level of film production was surprising: for awhile, filmmakers and companies who had learned to work together and fundraise production by production were able to ride out the downturn. However, to return to Table 1 of this document (Chapter 1), it was very clear by the mid 1990s that tumultuous politics and national endemic economic crises had combined to seriously devastate the film industry. Looking back on this time period, is also evident that, once opportunities presented themselves, there were plenty of filmmakers poised to participate in the resurgence of film production in Mexico.

1990s to Early 2000s: Globalization and New Strategies

The Mexican film industry from the 1990s and through the timeframe of this study repeated many of the patterns described above, including repercussions from the ways that politics and industry are inevitably interrelated. These years, especially from the 2000s on, have witnessed more diversity in the ranks of filmmakers and subject matter in film; they have also been defined by contemporary perspectives about how best

to advance Mexican cinema nationally and internationally. While neither internally consistent nor complimentary in approach, it seems that such diverse points of view, backed by institutional support from both private and public sectors, have resulted in some visible measures of success. These measures included:

- increased film production, as evidenced from Table 1 (Chapter 1);
- national and international box office successes for Mexican films, including Amores perros (2000, Dir. Alejandro González Iñárritu), Y tu mamá también (2001, Dir. Alfonso Cuarón), El crimen del padre Amaro (2002, The Crime of Padre Amaro, Dir. Carlos Carrera) and more recently La misma luna (Under the Same Moon, 2008, Dir. Patricia Riggen) and Arráncame la vida (Tear this Heart Out, 2008, Dir. Roberto Sneider);
- awards from prestigious international entities including an Oscar nomination for Amores Perros in 2001 (the first nomination of a Mexican film in 26 years), a Jury Prize from Cannes in 2007 for Luz silenciosa (Silent Light, 2007 Dir. Carlos Reygadas), and a Caméra d'Or award for Año bisiesto (Leap Year, 2010, Dir. Michael Rowe) from Cannes in 2010 to name a few.

The recent international triumphs at the Academy Awards of Mexican nationals Carlos Cuarón for Gravity (2013) and Alejandro González Iñárritu, for films Birdman: Or (The Unexpected Virtue of Ignorance) (2014) and The Revenant (2015), along with the cinematographer of the films Emmanuel Lubezki, has also been part of another trend that has brought international visibility and credibility to Mexican filmmaker creatives working on English-language projects; this tier of success, though, runs parallel to the national industry as experienced within Mexico.

Prior to the 2000s and the successes referred to above, filmmakers first had to survive the 1990s. A significant change took place within IMCINE in the early 1990s.

Initially functioning as sole producer on projects it supported, by 1991 it had completely converted to operating as a co-producer, in part to address its increasingly diminishing budgets, and in part to better encourage auteur cinema by leaving much of the control of the films to the producing partners and the directors (Pérez Turrent, "Crises and Renovations" 111-12; Mora, Mexican Cinema 1896-2004 185, 191). CONACULTA and IMCINE's evolving perspectives on the arts opened the door for independent cinema to speak out on issues that had traditionally been censored, perhaps most notably represented by Jorge Fons' Rojo amanecer (Red Dawn, 1990)—the first feature-length film to deal with the subject of 1968's Tlatelolco massacre. Another significant aspect of 1990s cinema was that women were visibly participating as directors—gaining national and international recognition.

Women began directing and producing feature films that revealed their gendered position and sought to present new ways of "seeing" and "being" through the cinema, ways that contested their historical position as social subjects. These films were part of a larger national sense of intellectual production that saw filmmakers as artists with the capacity to inform public life—in this sense to provide alternate visions of what it meant to be a Mexican man or woman in their society. Films directed by women such as Danzón (1991, Dir. María Novaro), Novia que te vea (May I See You a Bride, 1992, Dir. Guita Schyfter), and Angel de fuego (Angel of Fire, 1992, Dir. Dana Rotberg) joined other movies directed by men like La tarea (Homework, 1991, Dir. Jaime Humberto Hermosillo), La mujer de Benjamín (Benjamin's Woman, 1991, Dir. Carlos Carrera), and Sólo con tu pareja (1991, Dir. Alfonso Cuarón) in exploring issues of sexuality, relationships, feminism, masculinity, and social realities and experiences, from a multiplicity of perspectives open to challenging the strictures of the past. As a group, this wave of films penetrated not only national spaces, but also international, and contributed

to how "Mexican cinema" was defined during those years (Rashkin; González Vargas 35-82).

After the promising start of the 1990s, the film industry suffered another round of national economic crises that decimated its funding structures. President Ernesto Zedillo, whose term began in 1994, was not entirely uninterested in supporting the industry and did direct some funds towards IMCINE as well as towards establishing FOPROCINE.[21] However, he often found himself and his administration at odds with filmmakers who wanted more autonomy than bureaucrats were willing to grant (Maciel, "Cinema and the State" 225-26). Then, in 1997, a significant turnover of government happened during the mid-term elections, and the Congress' majority shifted from the President's party, the historically dominant Partido Revolucionario Institucional (Institutional Revolutionary Party, or PRI), to the Partido de la Revolución Democrática (Party of the Democratic Revolution, or PRD). The celebrated actor María Rojo was among those elected to this reorganized Congress; her work in such controversial films as Rojo amanecer and La tarea, as well as her participation in and staunch public support for feminist/feminine-themed films, established her as an artist with convictions and a commitment to improving Mexican art and the nation. Rojo immediately threw herself into an ambitious project, backed by many filmmakers and actually at odds with theater owners: revamping the Federal Cinematographic Law.

In 1998, the Ley Cinematográfica was ratified, and some of its provisions are useful to frame Mexican cinema trends in the 2000s, specifically these noted by David Maciel:

---

[21] FOPROCINE, the Fund for the Production of Quality Films, was created to allocate coproduction funds for Mexican feature films that were perceived to be in the art cinema category; this includes low-budget fiction films and documentary feature films (approximately $1 million USD or lower). The funds have not been treated as grants, but rather IMCINE/FOPROCINE has come on board as an investment partner.

- A 10 percent exhibition time for Mexican cinema
- Better stimulus and conditions for the production of Mexican films in Mexico and abroad
- A substantial fund entitled FIDECINE established for the production of Mexican films with monies from the government and the private sector[22]
- The statement that Mexican cinema is a valuable national artistic and educational manifestation and as such should be supported and partially funded by the federal government. The Ley makes it clear that cinema, like other arts, should be a major responsibility of the state. ("Cinema and the State" 227)

What seems to have happened in the early 2000s, as noted in the introduction to this section, is that rather than remaining largely reactive to a top-down vision of Mexican film at the whim of the state and the political process (as had been dominant practice since the inception of Mexican film), film production was being diversified in order to reflect a variety of interests and project parameters. This was facilitated by the state serving as co-producer rather than sole producer as it had in the past. The relationship was still uneasy, but many filmmakers recognized that without state support, Mexican cinema production was likely to shrink or disappear. Additionally, and reflected by IMCINE-administered state funding structures of FIDECINE and FOPROCINE, Mexican cinema explicitly began to be supported along both commercial and artistic lines, with an emphasis in both cases on measuring success in appropriate benchmarks for commercially and artistically oriented projects. This project returns specifically to this latter point about IMCINE support in Chapter 3's section "Development: Contexts and Definitions" and subsequent discussions. To illustrate briefly a couple ways in which

[22] The content of the bullet points is quoted from Maciel; this note is mine. FIDECINE, the Fund for Film Investment and Stimulation, was created to provide coproduction, post-production, distribution, and exhibition support for fiction and animated features. The funds have not been treated as grants, but rather IMCINE/FIDECINE has come on board as an investment partner. These are commercially oriented films, budgets typically over $1 million USD, for which IMCINE/FIDECINE has expected return on their investment.

IMCINE began to track and measure "success," consider that it is only in recent history that as an institution it began to report on box office revenues for Mexican film as well as for international awards won, with most in-depth data being available starting in the 2000s (México, IMCINE, Ingresos totales; IMCINE, "Premios internacionales").

Year	Total revenue	Revenue from Mexican productions and coproductions	% of Mexican against Total
1991	647	32.5	5.0
1992	698	**	n/a
1993	752	**	n/a
1994	779	17.1	2.2
1995	744	19.7	2.6
1996	1,006	14.9	1.5
1997	1,991	15	.75
1998	2,622	14	.53
1999	3,755	87	2.3
2000	4,160	331	8.0
2001	4,049	336	8.3
2002	4,685	448	9.6
2003	4,545	248	5.5
2004	5,391	295	5.5
2005	5,697	242	4.2
2006	6,076	395	6.5
2007	6,673	497	7.4
2008	7,272	533	7.3
2009	7,730	496	6.4
2010	9,032	503	5.6
2011	9,755	613	6.3
2012	10,674	427	4*
2013	11,860	1,423	12*
2014	11,237	1,124	10*

Table 2: Box Office Revenue in Mexico in Thousands of Pesos (1991-2014)[23]

[23] Sources: IMCINE online Ingresos totales for years 1991-2010. IMCINE Anuario 2011 for 2011.
* IMCINE Anuario 2014 provided limited data for years 2012-2014, basically Total revenue and a flat market share for Mexican films, as opposed to Revenue from Mexican productions or coproductions.

For example, Table 2 above provides a snapshot of box office revenues in Mexico, and illuminates how little share of the total Mexican films have held in recent decades, points we will return to in upcoming discussions.

The first few films released in the 2000s may well have set the stage, along with the Ley Cinematográfica, for the current cycles of Mexican film productions. Interestingly, the wave of Amores perros (2000), Y tu mamá también (2001), and El crimen del padre Amaro (2002) proved to both national popular audiences as well as national and international critical publics that Mexican filmmakers could achieve success at home and abroad. One aspect that makes these three films unusual, and still sets them apart from most others, is that each film managed to achieve a level of success on both platforms; more often than not, as with other film sectors, films that are "popular" and films that are "critical/art cinema" appeal to different audiences. Additionally, prior to and into the 1990s, most Mexican filmmakers tended to stick to developing the national industry, and co-production money, when sought out, was largely from Europe.

With a Euro-auteur mentality informing cineaste's intellectual perspective, and the historically antagonistic socio-political relationship between the US and Mexico, Mexican filmmakers generally considered Hollywood a corrupting and overpowering influence and, as such, cooperation was to be avoided. At the very least, a recognition that Hollywood as a force was something to be reckoned with, and that its production dominance and distribution reach into Mexico was not diminishing any time soon, shaped private and public sector discourse about identity and power—especially around the time of industrial collapse when unemployment in the Mexican film industry was rampant, and screens were dominated by Hollywood product. Evidence of this may be seen in such

---

** = no data available

symposia as one organized in 1998, "Los que no somos Hollywood / We Who Are not Hollywood," with María Rojo as a leading force, along with other legislative partners and members of the film community (Ugalde, "La sociedad fílmica" 124; Delgado).

With this backdrop in mind, Amores perros exemplifies a shift away from obscure art cinema and towards audience-oriented filmmaking. It is also illustrative of the trends in Mexican cinema at the beginning of the 21st century: an obsession with the city (especially Mexico City), as a place of wonder and conflict; a knowledge of and formation in world cinema including Hollywood; and a writer/director team who do not want to be relegated to Mexican "art" cinema of the past, misunderstood by its own audiences and unappreciated by world audiences. As Paul Julian Smith notes in his monograph, the film calculatedly pushes away from entirely obscure cinema (à la Ripstein) or entirely commercial "trash" (à la mass-produced genre films) and throughout its domestic and international campaigns the creative forces behind Amores Perros strategically negotiated these competing platforms. In the end, Smith argues, the film's success on both these stages opened a space for potential reconciliation between commerce and art in Mexican cinema.

The word "potential" is key, though, as exceptions in cases like these often prove the rule; few films that work for Mexican general audiences transcend that exhibition space to reach international audiences, and few films that circulate in the art cinema circuit and in international film festivals are embraced by Mexican audiences (ref. Gutiérrez). However, the fact remains that in the 2000s, Mexicans did return to the box office including to watch Mexican-produced films (see Table 2), and Mexican filmmakers have enjoyed international attention and awards for their work. Urban crime stories and comedies have become mainstays on Mexican screens in the years following the success of Amores perros and Sexo, pudor y lágrimas (Sex, Shame, and Tears, 1999,

Dir. Antonio Serrano). The crime stories may be dark or combined with comedy (often inspired by Quentin Tarantino), and while comedies may also be dark, they often reach for broad comedy; the family comedy has experienced success as well. Films including Fernando Sariñana's Ciudades oscuras (Dark Cities, 2002), Hugo Rodríguez' Nicotina (Nicotine, 2003), Alejandro Lozano's Matando Cabos (Killing Cabos, 2004), Carlos Cuarón's Rudo y Cursi (Rudo & Cursi, 2008), Alejandro Springall's No eres tú, soy yo (It's not You, It's Me, 2010), and Patricia Martínez de Velasco's Aquí entre nos (Between Us, 2011) demonstrate these trends, with the first three exemplifying success in the crime story model, and the latter three belonging to the broader comedy cycles.

At the same time, a number of Mexican filmmakers have made names for themselves in international settings, where they have been recognized for the uniqueness of their work as well as for artistic vision, and hailed as cinematographic auteurs. Carlos Reygadas and Nicolás Pereda are two of many possible examples. Reygadas has been celebrated for the thematically challenging films including Japón (Japan, 2002), Batalla en el cielo (Battle in Heaven, 2005) and the aforementioned Luz silenciosa; his work gained recognition as part of the European co-production circuit as well as through international distribution circuits. Pereda is a Mexican filmmaker whose career gained momentum through films he produced in Mexico during breaks from attending film school in Toronto. Within just a few years since his debut with ¿Dónde están sus historias? (Where Are Their Stories, 2007), Pereda created a name for himself as a director of films that often blur boundaries between documentary and fiction content and styles. Pereda's films demand active viewers and are typically alienating to popular audiences. It should also be stated that veteran filmmakers such as Arturo Ripstein and Felipe Cazals, who fought to remain active and relevant through tumultuous decades in Mexico, have continued to make films every few years under during the 2000s, enjoying

recognition at home and abroad for their work, and serving as inspiration to younger generations.

As we near the end of this section, three historical notes should be addressed as backdrop to the above and subsequent discussions, as they informed choices made by those who decided to create and deploy the activities of the International Pitching Market at EEC/GIFF, the Encuentro at FICG, and Morelia Lab at FICM. These are:

- President Vicente Fox's neoliberal and global visions, an approach that would also be favored by subsequent President Felipe Calderón, but which would find uneven support with filmmakers and public institutions;
- the tension between public and private funding sources in Mexico, especially in the early 2000s, and how this affected filmmakers like Reygadas, González Iñárritu, Alfonso Cuarón, and Guillermo del Toro's options and decisions in terms of how to fund their films;
- and—something that certainly surprised me when I learned about it because of my background experience in US film schools—the fact that film schools in Mexico did not have a production studies track as an option until 2011.

The first two of the above points are more directly related to each other than to the third, but all three go together in that they describe a climate in which certain aspects of support for film were prioritized over others by Mexican institutions, leaving the cultivation of professional producers as the least attended priority.

Soon after Fox's presidential term began, IMCINE's budget was hit with cuts, and filmmakers especially felt the impact in the areas of FOPROCINE and FIDECINE. These cuts were met with public protests which would continue through Fox's term, and which escalated in 2003 when Fox pushed for privatization of major cultural institions, including IMCINE, Estudios Churubusco Azteca, and the CCC. In the name of reforming

the national budget, and executing changes in favor of free-market operations, Fox and his advisors proposed selling the state's film assets, privatizing or even perhaps eliminating each, but Congress blocked the measures and IMCINE, Estudios Churubusco Azteca, and the CCC remained in the public sector (Mora, Mexican Cinema 1896-2004 253-54; MacLaird 31; Ugalde, "La sociedad fílmica" 126). It was not that everyone in the filmmaking sectors were against free-market policies, but rather that a significant constituency held the belief "that a fully market-driven industry would take opportunies away from more marginalized voices, including artists, underrepresented communities, and young filmmakers who have not yet proven themselves worthy of capital investment" and continued to hold the state responsible for intervening at these levels (MacLaird 39).

Interestingly, according to Víctor Ugalde who was director of FIDECINE in its early years, one of the upsides of Fox's moves was actually that filmmakers responded and took action to reform IMCINE, to democratize funding structures with the resources available to them. Private funds had all but disappeared in the 1990s, which had inspired changes to the Cinematographic Law and the proposal for and creation of FIDECINE and then FOPROCINE. What Ugalde has pointed to, including in an interview with this author, was that Fox did not interfere with the committee's allocation of funds (when they had them to allocate). Ugalde stated: "from 2000 to 2006, those who administered the creation of films were the filmmakers."[24] He pointed to the fact that at the time, he and other people in positions at IMCINE were filmmakers themselves, up to and including the director of IMCINE, Alfredo Joskowicz (Ugalde Interview). Although there was pushback, and the system was admittedly not perfect, Ugalde has expressed the firm belief that they were laying groundwork for a process that provided funds to films, by

[24] Translated from original Spanish.

committee, based on merit not favoritism, counter to to previous systems which consensus has held were not democratic. Ugalde argued that funding decisions under the PRI—prior to Fox—were based on "vertical decisions without foundation, infused with nepotism, infused with corruption";[25] those overseeing fund distribution including for FIDECINE and FOPROCINE in the early 2000s were trying to build a different model (Ugalde Interview). Of course, debates between how film funds should be allocated once they got to IMCINE was part of a bigger discussion that started with whether or not the state should have so much influence on film funding in the first place.

Accordingly, there was an ongoing debate as to how much filmmakers could or should depend on private funds for their films, which brings us to the second of the historical notes above. The debate has been especially brought to the foreground by filmmakers including Reygadas, González Iñárritu, Alfonso Cuarón, and del Toro who have visibility on international stages with films not funded by the state. Reygadas has expressed frustration that, within Mexico, both private and public funds were hard for him to come by because he was not connected in the right circles (MacLaird 139). The so-called "three amigos" of Mexican cinema—González Iñárritu, Cuarón, and del Toro—have consistently turned to private funding through production company investment and partnering resources. Both Amores perros (2000, Dir. González Iñárritu) and Y tu mamá también (2001, Dir. Alfonso Cuarón) were produced without state subsidies. Their national and international successes actually impacted the trajectory of funding through IMCINE, influencing the institution to "[open] up to taking greater risks" and take more chances on "nontraditional filmmaking and first-time filmmakers" (MacLaird 140).

[25] Translated from original Spanish.

Even so, the "three amigos" embraced the return of private sector support for films in the late 1990s and early 2000s, and have continued to work to establish professional careers outside of funding from Mexico's public sector. In the cases of González Iñárritu with Altavista Films for Amores perros and Cuarón with Producciones Anhelo for Y tu mamá también, they were picked up by production companies that both aimed to support artistic freedom while also deploying clear marketing and distribution plans for their projects (MacLaird 137). In the early 2000s, Mora's research revealed that Latin American hits in global markets, including Mexican successes, were characterized by the common theme of being funded through private as opposed to state funds. Mora summarized del Toro's and Cuarón's attitudes as follows:

> Guillermo del Toro considers state-subsidized films a "fossilized approach." He said that "when you let in private investors, you're suddenly dealing with people who'll make an effort to recoup their capital. So they'll promote your film in a way that would never have happened in the past." Alfonso Cuarón agreed, preferring to secure financing from private investors rather than "corrupt" state agencies. (Mexican Cinema 1896-2004 256)

For his part, Alfonso Arau, another of the well-known Mexican cineastes and director of Como agua para chocolate (Like Water for Chocolate, 1992) which actually had been in part state funded, also agreed with previous statements of insularity within funding communities, which has not just affected those starting out in the business. In 2004 in an interview with Mora, Arau stated, "Government financing is negative because it's not the most talented who make movies but the ones with most friends, the most political" (Mexican Cinema 1896-2004 256). As noted previously, IMCINE did adjust its funding models based on the national and international success of filmmakers like the "three amigos." Furthermore, under Joskowicz's leadership, there was a concerted effort to restructure IMCINE with more divisions explicitly responsible for the promotion of Mexican film in both national and international contexts—for example overseeing the

creation and distribution of publications with film data and information, and promotion of Mexican films' participation in festivals, retrospectives, premieres, and subsequent distribution windows (México, IMCINE, Múltiples rostros 64).

However, before films may be exhibited or otherwise promoted or distributed, they first have to be made, which returns us to the third historical note of this subsection, a note on film schools. In addition to other institutional weaknesses that contributed to dips in production in recent decades, it cannot be overlooked that even though film schools have been active in Mexico since the 1960s and 1970s, training was not explicitly provided for producers. That is to say, that there was no production track of studies at the film schools. It was not until January 2011 that the CCC established and began to offer a two-year production studies track. It was not that no one had noticed, rather that the institutional practice—not limited to practices within film schools—had been that producers would learn on the job, either as an assistant on professional productions, or through working on projects in film school or on low-budget projects, essentially learning through trial and error (Taibo Interview; México, Secretaría de Cultura, "Dará el Centro de Capacitación Cinematográfica"). In 2010, the director of the CCC Henner Hofmann, announced there would be a new production track available in 2011:

> Hofmann stated that in Mexico there is currently good training for directors, photographers, and screenwriters, however, there is a lack of academic support for producers not only in technical areas but also at the creative level, for them to learn all of the steps that it takes to successfully complete a film. (México, Secretaría de Cultura, "Dará el Centro de Capacitación Cinematográfica")[26]

As I will discuss in upcoming sections and chapters, an overall lack of professional producers in the industry was one reason that Mexican festivals were inspired to step in

[26] Translated from original Spanish.

in the way that they did in the mid 2000s, with the initiatives of the IPM, the Encuentro, and Morelia Lab.

It is no exaggeration to say that among those invested in Mexico's cinematographic future, there is excitement about the past decade and a half of Mexican films and filmmakers. The above largely chronicles feature narrative films; however, it is important to mention there are also other veins of filmmaking including short films and documentaries that have been important to national identity, and have also experienced resurgence. These forms have also found audiences nationally through support by such festivals as FICM, GIFF, and the film festival Ambulante founded in 2005 by the Canana team of Gael García Bernal, Diego Luna, and Pablo Cruz. Ambulante is an itinerant festival, which has toured annually all over Mexico screening selections of national and international documentaries. Hopefully a diversity of Mexican cinema will continue to be supported over the next decades, not just those at the center of this study. Thus, an evaluation of how Mexican cinema has been fostered over the past ten to twenty years is critical.

If the systems in place that are working are going to continue, it is important to identify them, as well as to understand areas that are not working at all or could be working better for members of the film industry. The dissertation's central focus is on how films festivals have supported Mexican cinema, since each of them were founded with primary missions of exhibiting national cinema for their audiences, and that mission remains central in each case in each festival's design. Each festival also added to its exhibition platforms other initiatives "behind the screens" aimed at boosting numbers of Mexican films produced, with the festival initiatives' goals often tied to helping fledging projects helmed by new directors and inexperienced producers move from ideas into reality. In order to do so, the coordinators of these initiatives had to take some time to

assess the state of the Mexican film industry, their place in the global contexts of film production and circulation, and consider what might be the best platforms to create within national and global contexts to address the weaknesses they identified in the Mexican production system. Because of this, it is important to take a moment and define some of the industry terms and contexts that shaped the discussion and inform the present analysis. The next chapter takes a look at business models that have dominated the recent decades of film production and distribution, defining terms including "film development," "indie" vs. "Hollywood," "art cinema" and cult of the "auteur," amongst others, and how these impact films' circulation from pre-production through exhibition and distribution outlets. As we shall see in upcoming chapters, all of these contexts inform the festivals' identities and trajectories, both as they project them and as they are interpreted by other stakeholders in the industry.

Chapter 3: Film Industry Contexts and Film Festival Industry Initiatives

> The heart and soul of cinema is content creators: that is the directors and writers, and just letting them tell their story […]. In order to have a full healthy body around [the content] you need high quality technicians, well qualified producers that have a network of contacts and information, access and even street cred within the festival world so that they become believable as producers. You can't have a solid industry, a solid film industry, if you don't have a solid group of producers that sort of give you that credibility, because while great content creators and great content sort of have a life on its own, it doesn't lend itself to becoming industrially sound.
> - Hugo Villa Smythe, Director of Cinematographic Production, IMCINE, 2007-2013[27]

Within a complex film industry nexus that plays out on national and international stages, film festivals strive to establish themselves as vital and vibrant cultural institutions by (1) curating quality cinema programming in line with their missions, (2) hosting national and international stars and recognized industry talent, and (3) attracting visibility in press and industry trades, ideally being identified as movers and shakers within the global film milieu. From their founding to the time of this writing, Guadalajara International Film Festival (FICG, Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara, which debuted as a festival in 1986), the Guanajuato International Film Festival (GIFF, formerly Festival Internacional de Cine "Expresión en Corto (EEC)" debut 1998[28]) and the Morelia International Film Festival (FICM, Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia, debut 2003), have all demonstrated a commitment to establishing themselves in these manners. As will be addressed in this chapter, recent trends in film festival innovation have

[27] Hugo Villa Smythe, personal interview, 10 Jan. 2013.

[28] The name Expresión en Corto (EEC) is a play on words of sorts, as "Corto" means "short" as in the length of any object, and also it means "short film." The festival's name can be translated awkwardly as "Short Expressions," "Expressions in Short Form" or "Expressions in Short Film," but Expresión en Corto as an organization is always referred to as such, in Spanish. Since 2011, the festival has changed names. As of the time of this writing, it has rebranded itself officially the Guanajuato International Film Festival (GIFF), with its non-profit branch still named Expresión en Corto.

resulted in many festivals aiming to be industry leaders in two primary areas: first, the historically established official film exhibitions (the screening selection that reaches juries, festival attendees and guests, general audiences, and press); and, second, the more recend trend of offering a set of activities aimed largely if not exclusively at cultivating certain kinds of industry participation and advancement of certain kinds of film projects (activities that are geared towards a much smaller sub-set of attendees).

In order to better frame the general trends, and then to examine the Mexican festivals' individual trajectories in Chapters 4 through 6, Chapter 3 provides additional contextual and analytic frameworks. This chapter begins with a description of the Hollywood industrial process that has dominated much of the world's cinematic production and exhibition—including Mexico's—since the establishment of the Hollywood studio system. The analysis then turns to consider counter-Hollywood impulses including auteur/art cinema production and film festival exhibition, in which the festival phenomenon of the late 20th and early 21st Centuries holds significant stakes. Finally, the chapter evaluates representative and applicable scholarship and theoretical frameworks. At the time of this project's conception, this turned out to be a challenge that holds to the time of this writing. First, while a scholarly foundation is in the works through which to analyze film festivals, film festival analysis is a young field and fairly US and European-centric. Historical narratives had yet to be written for the three Mexican festivals, and documentation was almost entirely limited to primary sources—internal documents, festival publications, newpaper records, and the like—most of it in Spanish. Compounding this, there existed little more than anecdotal measures for assessing Mexican film festivals' "successes" or "failures"; even less so, consensus on how to assess whether or not their efforts were contributing to supporting national cinema production. In part, this stems from the lack of scholarship at more fundamental levels:

Mexico's cinematic history in English-language scholarship is limited, and therefore every sub-category of scholarship within its vast history, including with respect to festivals, is further marginalized in US cinema studies.

Because of this, this study's original goals of focusing primarily on case studies of films—at the International Pitching Market at EEC/GIFF, the Encuentro de Coproducción at FICG,[29] and Morelia Lab at FICM—to assess the programs' efficacies was modified. The first priority became to create a foundation for the study of Mexican film and festivals, beginning with contextualized histories of these three festivals. Then, upon that historical foundation, an evaluative framework could begin to be built. Although some reorientation of initial priorities was necessary to complete this study, the guiding inquiry remained the same: given the complexities of networks within and across film industries and institutions, within which these Mexican festivals each worked to establish their annual events as significant in the world film festival circuit, by what measures might we consider their efforts to be have been successful and for which stakeholders? Before we return to these questions in Chapters 4 through 6, we delve here into industry contexts and history, beginning with what film professionals mean when they talk about "development" and why this stage of film production is especially important to the considerations of this project.

DEVELOPMENT: FILM INDUSTRY CONTEXTS AND DEFINITIONS

As illustrated by the discussion up to this point, a lot of critical attention is focused on the interplay of institutions, filmmakers, and results, where successful industries are identified first through tallying numbers of completed films (along the lines

[29] Official festival materials provide the English translation of the event's name as "Coproduction Meeting"; however, it is still most common for industry professionals to refer to it by the original Spanish name of "Encuentro de Coproducción," or "Encuentro" for short.

of Table 1, indicating how many films were produced in Mexico annually), and second through tracking completed films that then achieve some level of recognition by a group or groups authorized to measure success. Such a group may be publics or viewers of films in a given setting, for which consumption numbers or other applicable data may be generated. For example, current concerns may be counts of box office attendance or revenue along the lines of Table 2, or DVD units sold, or estimated viewers of the film if it runs on a streaming service or on television. Publics along these lines are generally discussed as representing "popular" or "commercial" tastes that correlate to bankable return on a film's investment. Another authorized group could be comprised of cineastes including filmmakers and cinephiles, film academies and award granters, critics and critical tastemakers, and even academics; together, publics of this nature are considered the "critical" or "artistic" sector of consumers. While they may disagree on what constitutes artistically excellent work, each advocate is committed to championing his/her votes in that regard, whether or not those selections garner popular attention of any sort.

Yet, long before any movie reaches viewers, a series of people are involved with creating the concept, working on it, and backing it financially, from idea to completed film. While much attention is placed on what happens once a film is completed, because that is when it can reach audiences, for this project it is important to consider basic aspects of film pre-production. As will become clearer in the section below, "Film Festivals, Hollywood, and 'Indie' Cinema," when development, pre-production, and related elements are discussed in academic studies or critical debates, they are focused on the question of whether or not a particular film qualifies as an "independent" production. While useful for some discussions, it is most functional within the context of film industries such as those in the US, where major studio productions dominate, against which independent sectors may be identified. A two-pronged approach when applied

broadly and internationally tends to ignore significant disparities among the great number of films that are lumped together in the "independent sector." However, it is a good starting point.

Before continuing with the specifics of the Mexican industry, a number of general industrial terms and contexts should be defined and addressed. This includes working definitions of what is meant by the terms development, pre-production, and production, when applied very generally to film studies. Additionally, we need to delineate the reasons that development is considered a crucial part of a film's transition from idea to completed project. After this, these terms may be discussed further as related to the US major studio system, conglomeration, independent filmmaking, and how these contexts inform the contemporary Mexican film development landscape.

Development as Business Model

One of the major issues that the Mexican film industry was facing in the early 2000s was that, because national production had shifted almost entirely into the commercial sphere, there were few film professionals working on more creative or quality projects (Villa Smythe Interview). As Hugo Villa Smythe described it, the industrial infrastructure was weak, in particular in the area of professional producers. There were content creators willing to take creative risks, but that alone would not build a solid industry—producers were needed who could be sure that creative risks were shepherded through realistic and industrially sound production practices. When I spoke with him in 2013, Villa Smythe was looking at it from his perspective of being at the head of production of IMCINE, with the responsibility of organizing funds for FOPROCINE; he observed that over time, Mexican cinema had gone from the crisis mode of the 2000s to actually having some producers in the industry who could get films

developed and off the ground. Villa Smythe identified that additional efforts were still needed in order for more producers to have solid portfolios, skill sets, and networks, but seemed optimistic that they were going in the right direction for the Mexican film industry's recovery. His tempered optimism was based on the progress made in training producers through initiatives like Morelia Lab, or other initiatives at FICG or GIFF. Considering that even skilled producers run risks and experience failures, an unskilled producer can prove disastrous to projects, and by extension an entire industry lacking solid professional producers is one that will wither and die. One of the most important roles of a producer is to be able to see a project through to completion, balancing the creative team's vision with the reality of budgets, markets, or other related practical concerns. Within film business models, there are varying strategies for moving projects from an initial idea or concept, into the production and subsequent stages. While never exactly the same, nor even linear within any given venture, it is helpful to talk about the various stages that producers identify as part of every filmmaking process.

The first step encompasses activities collectively called "development." In film production contexts the term describes a specific stage in a film's life cycle. Angus Finney provides a nice overview and working definition of development, which he sums up as: "the work that surrounds the initial concept or story idea, the acquisition of that idea, the screenwriting process, the raising of development finance, and the initial stage of production planning" (22). An idea may come from any number of sources, including an original idea, or already existing material like a book or a play or an article. Film development encompasses working with that idea to convert it from inspirational concept (in someone's head) into concrete forms (written documents and preliminary visuals) that can attract other people to it. The point is to be able to bring together a team that will be

invested in—and capable of—shaping and supporting the idea along its path to realization as a movie.

Many projects never leave the concept stage, because for one reason or another, they do not attract enough interested people to them or they cost too much to get off the ground. In particular, they do not draw the attention of people who are willing to invest time or money into a project that is at a very risky stage and which cannot be predicted to provide a return on their investments. Project ideas that reach formal development generally have at the core a team of writer and producer, who work with each other and ideally with a few more key people to: (1) refine the basic story, often in the form of a treatment or story outline; (2) write and polish a script; (3) attract recognized talent to the project, particularly a bankable actor or recognized director; (4) attract a couple initial investors and map out a realistic financial plan for the project. If these elements come together—a process called "packaging," as it involves careful preparation of significant project details into a coherent reproducible presentation—the project may move from development into pre-production. In pre-production, all the major backers that have committed to the project work together to ensure the film moves forward.

During pre-production, ideally all creative, financial, and logistical elements of the project are worked out in preparation for production, when the team will actually film the movie. Furthermore, most professional producers will also work at the pre-production stage to line up as much of the post-production plan as possible (including again the corresponding creative, financial, and logistical aspects of completing the film), and concretize some distribution or exhibition deals (or at least have them in the works). The script, cast and crew, shooting dates, equipment, shooting locations, financiers and investors, contracts and permits, and the like must all be sorted out and confirmed before a film can be made. Pre-production is challenging as it requires tremendous coordination

on a number of fronts so that everything can come together at the right times during the production of the film. Even if all pre-production logistics are arranged satisfactorily and production is scheduled, it should be noted that film production is also fraught with unpredictability and requires that all involved be able to respond and adjust accordingly.[30]

The business of development through production is highly dependent on what type of creative and producing team is behind the project. It can also vary from country to country, based on what standard business practices may apply, what type of film industry infrastructure is in place, and/or what if any national cultural policies or support for film production exist. For the purposes of this discussion, the major organizational structures to consider are the US Major Studios and ranges of independent productions outside of the majors, both within the US and internationally.

The "Big Six"—Hollywood's Major Studios

In the contemporary landscape of filmmaking, Hollywood is a defining force with which much of the world including Mexico must contend. Hollywood identity and business models have been most recently dominated by six studios, collectively the "majors": Disney, Paramount, Columbia, 20th Century Fox, Universal, and Warner Bros. Since the 1980s, each studio has operated as part of larger conglomerate, that is, as one of many businesses, firms, or brands managed by a parent company. In one case, The Walt Disney Company, the studio identity has transformed over the years, acquiring or creating other companies to compliment its original studios and associated entertainment ventures (for example, its well-known theme parks) under the umbrella of Disney, rather

[30] The previous paragraphs combine summary from Angus Finney's work with my professional experience working with producers through the International Pitching Market at EEC and at Fanastic Market at Fantastic Fest.

than being absorbed by an existing conglomerate. In the other cases, the studios are holdings or divisions within diversified companies: at the time of this writing Paramount is a Viacom Company; Columbia is part of the Sony Corporation; 20th Century Fox is a News Corporation company; Universal is a subsidiary of Comcast NBCUniversal; Warner Bros. is part of Time Warner.

As a group, the six studios constitute the members of the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA).[31] Together, and backed by the MPAA, the studios form a virtual oligopoly in the film world. The majors' film-related divisions, as part of their conglomerates, "take in roughly 95 percent of film revenues annually in the US, by far the richest market in the work, and [...] dominate the global marketplace as well" (Schatz, "Film Industry Studies" 47). This affects Mexico directly, as illustrated by the fact that in 2011, of the top ten films at the box office, none was a Mexican film. Further, all but one of those ten were distributed by a US Major. The Twilight Saga: Breaking Dawn Part I (2011, Dir. Bill Condon), a film produced by Summit Entertainment, now a subsidiary of Lionsgate, is the only one of the top ten represented by a Mexican company, Corazón Films. Number one on the list, Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows Part II (2011, Dir. David Yates) reported almost eight million attendees; tenth on the list, Captain America: The First Avenger (2011, Dir. Joe Johnston) hauled in almost five million. The top attended Mexican film in 2011 was Don Gato y su pandilla (Top Cat, 2011, Dir. Alberto Mar), interestingly a reboot film of the popular 1960s Hanna-Barbera series. It placed overall as the 23rd most popular film of the year, with just under 2.6 million attendees. Notably it was distributed in Mexico by Warner Bros. on more than twice the number of

[31] As of this writing, Columbia is now incorporated in the division of Sony Pictures within Sony Corporation, and Sony Pictures has replaced Columbia as the named entity in the MPAA member organization list (Motion Pictures Association of America, "Our Story").

screens than any other Mexican film released in 2011 (México, IMCINE, Anuario 2011 31-32).

This commentary leads to another key aspect of the MPAA studios and their operations, which directly informs the above 2011 details. As part of conglomerates the majors' power and reach extend into the business world in two very important ways: vertical integration and horizontal integration of associated divisions of the parent corporation. The most basic way to describe this phenomenon is that no aspect of the conglomeration truly operates independently, a model known in business as "synergy." The goal of integration overall has been in fact tight interdependence, wherein related enterprises within a conglomerate ideally serve to compliment each other's productivity and profit margins, with as much business as possible managed in-house. Specifically, vertical integration refers to an organization controlling its interests along a given production line from the beginning of an idea, to exploitation of a finished product when it is presented to the public for revenue purposes. For entertainment industry output, these interests are generally described as production, distribution, and exhibition. Horizontal integration is also a way to maximize revenues and refers to an incorporation of multiple types of companies in the same tier on the vertical chart. For example, conglomerates "may own multiple media 'content suppliers' (film studios, TV and cable networks, and so on) and also multiple 'pipelines' to media consumers (theater chains, TV stations, cable systems, home video, online delivery, etc.)" (Schatz, "Film Industry Studies" 46).

When both types of integration are harnessed, a media conglomerate has a number of ways to insure that no matter when or where an audience sees its product, it owns the business and rights to collect on the revenue stream. Furthermore, the contemporary conglomerate may also own other parallel interests, such as theme parks or publishing or music, that all feed into each other. Many are familiar with Disney and its

parks full of characters from its films. Other illustrative examples include Time Warner Global Media Group's ownership of Warner Bros. Entertainment Company, which incorporates DC Entertainment; together they work to deploy characters from DC Comics, Vertigo, and others across film, television, comics, games, and related promotional products. Sony Corp., besides its Sony Pictures Entertainment division, includes Sony Pictures Television Group, Sony Music Entertainment, Sony Computer Entertainment (i.e. Playstation), to just name a few. While not all content is cross-platform, the idea can still be that each division helps each other. For example, within a conglomerate like Sony Corp., the music division can supply content for soundtracks for film, television, or video games; each division may then reduce the need to negotiate fees with an outside company with competing interests.

This synergy with respect to rights ownership on the recoupment side is directly linked to a tightly integrated development process. The Hollywood studios benefit from being part of a corporation on a number of levels including that, if they choose to produce a film, that film is automatically directly linked to distribution networks within the conglomeration. Because of this, the studios can actually budget for development as part of the long-term business plan for any film. Furthermore, they can absorb the costs of a number of projects being in development at the same time, because completed films that earn profits offset investment in the projects that never go anywhere. Development departments in Hollywood work with a number of ideas, at any given time twenty to thirty projects may be circulating, from which only about one in twenty will go into production. The studios combined spend quite a bit of money on development, estimated at over $1 billion USD annually (Finney 27). Recouping this and making profits is high stakes, and is a large part of what drives the majors towards fairly homogenous and

predictable products; they bank on developing and producing projects that look a lot like projects that have worked in the past (28).

Since the 1980s, but especially since the 1990s, the studios have entrenched themselves in blockbuster and franchise mentality. These two terms are related but not always the same, as blockbusters may or may not be generated from franchise material. In general by the 1990s, the studios regularly embraced the aesthetics and plot structures of the films like Steven Spielberg's Jaws, Raiders of the Lost Ark (1981), and E.T. (1982) that brought in audiences in droves and set the stage for imitators (Schatz, "The Return" 79, 82). Thomas Schatz characterizes this wave of films, as well as those they inspired, as "increasingly plot driven, increasingly visceral, kinetic, and fast-paced, increasingly 'fantastic' and reliant on special effect, and increasingly targeted at younger audiences" (82). Whether or not a blockbuster is based on a tried and true franchise (a series or set of characters with proven box-office records, like Batman or the X-Men), they are rarely drastically narratively or aesthetically innovative, but rather incorporate and model what has worked before. As discussed below in the "Independent Studios and Filmmakers" subsection, Hollywood narrative and style remain relatively aligned with classic models, designed to foreground story. Hollywood productions also rely on star power and heavy targeted advertising campaigns to attract audiences.

However, too much repetition of formula can also be counterproductive to attracting audiences. This sets up an interesting dynamic where major studios can be described, as E. Diedre Pribram argues, as codependent with US independent or foreign studios. The independent and/or foreign studios often take narrative, aesthetic, casting or other risks for a variety of reasons including in the name of artistic vision or outright budget limitations. Innovation that works on the independent level, or stars that establish their names outside the studio system, may then be incorporated into or sought out for a

studio project. The tension is one that can provide hope for filmmakers (writers, directors, producers, actors, crew, etc) who want to access the studio system, as with the right hit they may be given that opportunity. On the other side, it can be a concern for filmmakers who want more autonomy than a studio system production provides, and who do not want their vision for their films to be subsumed within Hollywood's style.

Independent Studios and Filmmakers

As Hollywood's major studio business models and film projects have evolved over the past few decades, so has the landscape for films made outside of that system. One of the more difficult aspects of discussing independent production relative to the majors is that the range is quite broad. The ends of the scale may be described as running from films produced by indie divisions of the majors, such as when Miramax was acquired by Disney or when 20th Century Fox created Fox Searchlight Pictures, to movies that are made by filmmakers entirely without professional or institutional support. For the sake of this project, it is most useful to focus on the ways that films unconnected to the studio system may operate, as "Independent producers close to the Studio system tend to treat independent sources of finance in a similar manner to a Studio, albeit at a different level of financial support" including having a development budget built in to her/his total production fee (Finney 28).

Basically, as integrated and programmatic as the studio system development and pre-production processes are in order to minimize any investment losses, for independents these processes are fraught with uncertainty and risk. For independents, there is no distribution partner or pipeline automatically ready to help promote a finished film. There is no multi-hedged income and budget from other sectors, able to absorb development costs or production costs should a film never be made, or should a

competed film never recoup its investments. What this translates into is that in both the US independent and European sectors, a rigorous development process is traditionally undervalued. Finney identifies a few reasons for this, starting with the obvious one that in both cases, producers are not paid until a project is in production—or perhaps even after or never, if they have deferred rights. This incentivizes moving a film into production as quickly as possible. In the US, he attributes the rush to the fact that public funds are low, and barriers to entry into distribution channels are high (25-26). He also alludes to another factor which is widely recognized and also identified by Pribram, in that in a substantial number of cases the independent writer or director in the US is interested in reputation-building, in making something to draw attention to their work and thereby gain access to Hollywood's institutions after a feature or two (Finney 25; Pribram 7-8). In Europe, Finney argues, the challenge to producers who wish to shepherd a project through a thorough development process stems from the auteur tradition, in which both the writer and the producers are marginalized in favor of director control of the project. In mature models of independent development, a creative producer works with a writer and script editor while the financial producer consolidates the projects' selling points into a package to attract investors, often before a director is even brought on board; once the director is on board, the financial producer can attempt to include that as part of the package for further investors and potentially pre-sales for distribution (Finney 26, 28-30).

Ultimately, not having stable financial support for development is an enormous point of vulnerability for independent film projects, and it is directly linked to the other major hurdle that independent filmmakers face: not being tied into major distribution pipelines. However, not all of this should be viewed negatively, as these disconnections also create the conditions for what the term "independence" implies: the potential space for differentiation from Hollywood that many filmmakers seek, or at least attempt to

exploit. The discursive construct of financial and creative distinction from Hollywood's studio constraints has provided a basis for the circulation of films within niche venues or distribution outlets. Most of the US independent and foreign filmmakers whose work this project frames draw on the evolution of the auteur theory and the art cinema cycles it inspired, whose origins can be traced to European filmmakers and film movements of the 1950s and 1960s, especially but not limited to Ingmar Bergman, Federico Fellini, and the cineastes of the French New Wave. It is important to keep in mind that no film movements exist in a vacuum. For example, avant-garde cycles of film that privilege experimentation, or documentary filmmakers who also have developed a variety of formal and narrative technique, or other genres, all influence US independent and foreign filmmakers, and all have the potential to affect Hollywood. However, on a continuum of radical or experimental forms to the most classical and conservative styles, art cinema is generally considered a relative middle ground; it is still a narrative form but not an entirely classical one. US independent and foreign film share some general characteristics that are identified with or draw from art cinema, and that are linked to the nature of their development and pre-production tendencies.

The core idea of the auteur theory that permeated film culture and still resonates in the US independent and international art cinema is "the notion that a body of films expresses a director's personal vision of life, and that this vision can be traced from film to film through a repeating or progressive stylistic and thematic patterns" (Pribram 57). Basically the director is heralded as the author and artistic visionary of films in this vein; contemporary prominent examples include Terrence Malick, Alejandro González Iñárritu, Michael Haneke, and Pedro Almodóvar. In Hollywood this is unlikely to be the case, or really even matter, unless the director as star may be used to sell the film. Art cinema films do not have to have an auteur behind it, but often that is the case. Other

elements associated with art cinema are those that are used to delineate "high" arts (accessible to those trained or interested in those arts) from the "popular" arts (accessible to pretty much anyone). They are most often grouped into two fields: (1) disruption of classical narrative structure and character development; and (2) stylistic or formal elements that call attention to themselves and/or interrupt the viewer's absorption into character and story. For example, where Hollywood leans towards linear stories (with clear beginnings, middles, and ends) and goal-oriented characters whose motivations are straightforward, art cinema narration counters with stories that may lack such story order and resolution, and with central characters that lack clear motivation or direction. Additionally, while Hollywood style is conservative in the sense that the audience should rarely notice it and never be confused by it, art cinema's formal techniques may be employed to the opposite effect. Even when telling a relatively straightforward story, art cinema films are often characterized by their formal artistry (ref. Bordwell; Pribram 55-58; G. King, American 60-107).

Aspects of this permeate US independent film, although certainly not all US independent film, nor all foreign films, aspire to art cinema classification. The aesthetic and narrative aspects of high art described above are only a couple of the possible ways that US independent and foreign filmmakers' works are distinguished from Hollywood. Additional possible distinctions are categorized by Pribram (and evident in Geoff King's analyses as well) along the lines of budget, funding sources, distribution channels and release patterns, audiences, actors, and directors. Broadly, independent and foreign films operate on lower to much lower budgets than Hollywood studio productions; they are often funded largely or wholly outside of major studio sources; they rely on finding distribution through non-major channels, and usually have to have the film completed before securing a distributor, if they are able to attract one at all; and they rely on

specialized audiences who are interested in films that may offer different experiences than Hollywood films. Additionally, their directors and leading actors are likely to be from three camps: (1) unknowns at least in terms of the Hollywood star system; (2) known actors or directors who are building or reestablishing a reputation as a star or bankable director; or (3) actors or directors who are committed to working outside of the Hollywood studio production system. Hollywood's distribution, and therefore production, models rely on being able to sell their products including using star power. Independent and foreign films may also deploy such elements; however, by comparison they are less likely to have access to big names than Hollywood does at the level of development.

As noted above, a professional film development process takes all of the above elements into account from the story idea through securing distribution. However, as Finney notes, few independent filmmakers have access to the resources of a financially supported development process, which in turn encourages them to turn to production before they have thought through a full business model corresponding to a project's particular potential in the marketplace. Considering that Mexican filmmakers have almost exclusively been operating as "independent" filmmakers, outside of the Hollywood major studios, it makes sense that in Mexico most have operated without putting substantial time into development; in other words, with limited resources and no entrenched development model, the focus has been heavy on production and favored an attitude of "let's see what happens when the film's done." This correlates to what Finney identifies, a tendency for auteur-oriented writer/directors to outwardly disdain any nod towards commerce in the planning of film production. Leonardo Zimbrón, an established Mexican producer, in an interview with this author, lamented the fact that in Mexico, development has been the most neglected aspect of filmmaking in the country. Zimbrón, who has

worked as an independent producer in Mexico for many years, also held the position of Head of Local Development at Warner Bros. Mexico from its establishment in 2005 until it closed in 2010. As of the time of this writing, considering that Warner Bros., Disney/Miravista, and Columbia have all closed their local production branches (each open for only a few years in the late 2000s), Mexican production is independent of the major studios.

According to Zimbrón, only the few professional independents ("los profesionales") in Mexico have in practice invested resources into development, incorporating an understanding from the beginning of an endeavor as to what potential audiences might be served once the project is complete. His comments about Mexico resonate with Finney's statements about Europe, that development is an especially high risk phase, with the least prospect of recoupment on that investment; also that it is short sighted to put a film into production without it. However, few resources for development funds have existed in recent years except those through IMCINE. Under the FOPROCINE and FIDECINE guidelines, acquiring funds through IMCINE has required some attention to project packaging, in order to convince the committee that the project is viable. Attention to project packaging is part of development, which most filmmakers want to skip, and this very attitude can keep them out of the IMCINE loop. Zimbrón also noted that IMCINE's current funding structures explicitly split applications along the lines of art cinema and lower budgets (FOPROCINE, film budgets $1 million USD give or take) and commercially oriented cinema and higher budgets (FIDECINE, film budgets over $2 million USD). Filmmakers applying should, in theory, be able to identify clearly which route their projects are more suited to pursuing, however in practice that has not typically been the case in Zimbrón's experience (Zimbrón Interview).

It should also be noted that development and pre-production with an eye on a complete budget including post-production, never mind distribution and promotion, is also lacking in many independent sectors. Because of this, filmmakers who manage to get a production off the ground may run into any number of difficulties that can be mitigated or even avoided with appropriate preparation. Even experienced producers encounter complications, often leading to unforeseen spending in production and overcosts there and/or in post-production; these can threaten a film's chances of even reaching completion. Strengthening producer experience and training can minimize poor outcomes, and could also be a factor in sustaining the current trend of increased Mexican film output relative to the early 2000s. As noted above, in Mexico, film schools have historically been strongest in training directors and cinematographers, and weaker in other areas including production management. This may in part be due to the nature of academic study, which privileges finishing projects by end of semester or other constraining due dates, thereby adding a deadline dimension not exactly congruent to professional production. However, it has been a perception of working professionals in Mexico, including by Andrés Martínez Ríos (founder of Aatomo Rentas and Chemistry Cine) and Carlos Taibo (an experienced producer with a strong track record in mentoring producers towards project completion), that filmmaker training was especially weak in the areas of screen writing and development. The trend they observed in the first decade of the 2000s was that filmmakers had a tendency to undervalue the development process, above all to neglect refining their scripts and preparing for productions in a way that supported the telling of solid and carefully crafted story ideas. Post-production and completion of a viable film were directly affected by such poor planning (Martínez Ríos Interview; Taibo Interview).

This is precisely where the festivals' industry activities have been attempting to step in with support. FICG, GIFF, and FICM have not reinvented the wheel, but instead have looked to models developed elsewhere to develop activities for filmmakers. These models include primarily European festival initiates and arts funding for film. We return to a discussion of the Mexican festivals later in this chapter before moving on to chapters devoted to each of the festivals and the major industry initiative case studies, starting with Guanajuato and the International Pitching Market, then Guadalajara's Encuentro de Coproducción, and finally Morelia as host of Morelia Lab. Prior to this, for context, it is important to consider a brief history of the global phenomenon of film festivals, as well as their changing roles over the past couple decades with respect to both the distribution circuit and their relationship to up-and-coming filmmakers.

FILM FESTIVALS, "INDIE" CINEMA, AND THE CULT OF THE AUTEUR

What the three featured Mexican film festivals have undertaken since 2003 has followed a similar trajectory to that of the evolution of other prominent international festivals. Venice and Cannes were the sites of the world's first film festivals, both of which were inaugurated in the late 1930s; these cultural initiatives understandably did not really have a chance to come into their own before World War II ravaged Europe's population and infrastructure. In the post-war years, the two festivals reemerged and reorganized, and other European cities followed suit by founding their own festivals. By the 1960s and 1970s, film festivals were springing up worldwide, principally in the global North.[32] From the 1980s on, film festivals have been founded seemingly

[32] The vocabulary of "global South" and "global North" originates from economic descriptions that have by and large replaced previous models of First World, Second World, etc. The term global North refers to countries classified by the United Nations as having relatively high human development. Almost all of these countries are located in the northern hemisphere. Global South refers to countries classified by the UN as being in the medium to low human development categories. Most of these countries are located in the southern hemisphere, specifically in Africa, Asia, and Central and South America (Damerow).

everywhere, in various sizes and with equally varied missions. In 1979, Variety counted 188 festivals and markets in the world (cit. in Acheson, et al). By 2001 counts exceeded 500; and by 2003, there were almost 700, according to the International Federation of Film Producers Association (cit. in Iordanova and Rhyne). Festivals have proliferated to the point that sites or sources that have lists are careful to say that the ones on their lists are of major festivals or are representative and not all-inclusive. The online Film Festival Directory managed by Festival Focus stated that, as of early 2012, over 4,000 film festivals are held each year; IMCINE's 2011 "overview" report of Festivals and Film Events listed 87 festivals and showcases that took place just throughout Mexico that year (Anuario 2011, 50-51).

Film festivals have functioned as important sites of film exhibition and consumption, and festivals have arisen in local settings that address the concerns of the founders. They often originate with a mission to provide a platform for the presentation of films that otherwise would not be seen in their locale without a festival's initiative. Most festivals necessarily exist on their own points along a scale of complimentary to antagonistic to Hollywood, as Hollywood dominates much of world exhibition and distribution of film titles. Since the 1980s especially, Hollywood's model of production, advertising, and distribution of its titles has reestablished the major studios as titans, each studio within its own conglomerate that is vertically and horizontally integrated to

---

This distinction and terminology has been applied within film funding and academic scholarship settings to apply "global South" to these same regions, pertaining to the relative disadvantage of their film industries with respect to the global North, especially as compared to the US and Europe (ref. Falicov, "Migrating"; Peterson; Avila). Further with respect to Latin American film, the term global South is also in distinction to the New Latin American Cinema and Third Cinema movements, which describe particular political cycles of filmmaking which surged in Latin American in the 1960s and 70s. Contemporary global South film may still incorporate militant or other radical elements, but it is not a prerequisite of their belonging to this group. It is a broad category. However, within it, nationalism still matters and many funds or initiatives are particular about what countries they support as part of their missions (Falicov, "Migrating" 6-7+).

maximize revenues on their intellectual properties. Hollywood's products dominate nationally and internationally, except in rare cases where another national industry is the juggernaut, for example in India. It is not surprising that at the same time as Hollywood reinvented (and continues to adjust) itself in such a way as to absorb rival upstarts and then squeeze out competition, two complimentary industrial initiatives have tried to find traction and operate successfully: independent production and independent exhibition/distribution circuits.

Cine clubs, universities, and a few independent exhibitors led the way in the 1960s and 1970s to try to reach audiences that Hollywood was ignoring, especially the youthful voices and voices of dissent against the establishment rising in the global North. As Hollywood-linked conglomerates began absorbing theatrical outlets in the US in the 1980s, the exhibition of independent and foreign film floundered. Hollywood also increasingly turned to franchise films as opposed to original stories for their output, leaving independent voices and stories without substantial backing at either the production or distribution levels. By the end of the 1980s, the few distributors who had been taking risks with independent films were in trouble as there were few screens available as outlets for exhibition (ref. Wyatt). Notably, some of these counter-Hollywood trends had extended south as well, for example producing a wave called New Latin American Cinema in the late 1950s and 1960s that was entirely aligned with leftist politics and calls for reform (ref. Martin).

Film festivals historically have been at the center of politics regarding issues of quality cinema. Since the major festivals for many years were founded and based in Europe, they set the tone for what constituted art cinema, influenced who was celebrated as an auteur, and engaged with trends set by cinematic taste makers (aka the cinephiles who attended the festival and reacted to the films). What developed in the 1960s and

1970s could be described as the foundation of a canon of the film festival circuit, as a set of films with particular discursive relationships to their directors, festival programs, film industries, and audiences (ref. Wong 100-128). This tradition is alive and well, carried through today by Europe's major festivals, especially Cannes, but also Berlin, Venice, Rotterdam, and influences others including North American festivals like Toronto and Sundance. They compete with each other to find and launch the latest auteur, to program the most progressive and celebrated new films before others discover them, to develop their own unique identity through programming that no other festival can offer.

This competition reflects a tough reality of the film festival circuit that can be obscured by discussing film festival proliferation. Even though the majority of film festivals are in cultural sectors as opposed to for-profit ventures, they must still recoup or otherwise raise enough money to keep running each year. Important film festivals have shuttered over the years, including the Los Angeles Latino International Film Festival after its 16th edition in 2013, to mention just one that shook the independent film world. What this has meant, especially in the past couple decades, is that festivals must navigate the contemporary tension where the need to sell tickets and attract corporate support can undermine a festival's ability to commit to promoting niche cinema or launching new artistic careers. Cinephiles like Robert Koehler have pointed to the complexities of sustaining a true art cinema circuit in the contemporary landscape. While not without hope, Koehler has described how Sundance has veered from catering to cinephiles, and "influenced other, smaller festivals to follow its practice of loading up with world premieres and as much English-language work as possible, at the expense of films from the vaster non-English world that challenge conventional cinema language and modes" ("Cinephilia and Film Festivals" 86). That said, especially in the US and North America, Sundance's model is incredibly influential. As an organization, Sundance has launched

careers and continues to support a sector of the industry that is more popular than general European art cinema fare, but less bankable than Hollywood blockbuster fare.

In the 1990s the Sundance Institute, its corresponding film festival, and Miramax, as major players along with a host of minor players, emerged to set the parameters for "independent" or "indie" cinema as a class of films in the US and international markets. The films they championed were perceived as fresh, often edgy, personal films, with claims to director-as-auteur status, low to so-called "no" budget, lesser known to unknown talent, and often challenging aesthetic elements and/or story content. The success of sex, lies, and videotape (Steven Soderbergh, 1989) on the festival circuit and then in the theatrical circuit buoyed Miramax as it got off the ground, along with a few other choices they made in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Their achievements went along with some other success stories in the independent world, where profits on a release, even if relatively small, could sustain acquisitions and thereby allow them to continue to pay filmmakers for film rights. A few of Miramax's acquisitions proved that there were theatrical and post-theatrical audiences for foreign films, for example The Cook, the Thief, His Wife and Her Lover (Peter Greenaway, 1990), The Crying Game (Neil Jordan, 1992), and The Piano (Jane Campion, 1993), even including foreign films with subtitles like The Double Life of Veronique (Krzysztof Kieslowski, 1991) and Like Water for Chocolate (Alfonso Arau, 1993) (ref. Biskind, Down and Dirty Pictures).

Although scholars including Geoff King and E. Diedre Pribram, and industry experts including Peter Biskind, often discuss how one may judge if a film qualifies as "independent" or "indie" cinema based on its production, especially with regard to the low budget and uncompromising artistic vision of a given director, interestingly much of the attention given to "indie" film is really at the end product or distribution level. To put it another way, films released at the theatrical level are calculatedly marketed to potential

audience segments, and the "indie" marketing sector comprises a set of packaging strategies that are arguably distinct from the Hollywood blockbuster marketing model. Part of what may help niche films reach niche audiences is to deploy elements in display of independent-ness, at the marketing level, and which are based on the production elements of that film. A campaign may call attention to a director known for an anti-Hollywood stance, and/or a low budget, and/or an edgy script, etc. in order to develop the credentials necessary to appeal to audiences looking for such films. In both King's and Pribram's discussions, at the level of distribution, foreign films are frequently lumped in with US independent films. Just for one example, when discussing the distributor Miramax, if they pick up a film, no matter where its country of origin, it circulates discursively as part of the US "indie" circuit.

However, even as this marketing approach does provide a valuable set of criteria by which to discuss difference between Hollywood and independent cinema on one level, in practice it tends to erase all but minor differences between films produced under US independent conditions and conditions elsewhere, as in the global South, specifically in this case in Mexico. By way of illustration, consider the film Amores perros (Alejandro González Iñárritu, 2000); its reported budget was $2 million USD, in a year that IMCINE reported the average Mexican film budget as $1.29 million (México, IMCINE, "Costo promedio"). That meant that $2 million was a huge budget for a Mexican film, and the overall average at least through 2013 was reported as still being under that figure (Anuario 2013 25). When Roberto Sneider produced and directed Arráncame la vida (Tear This Heart Out) in 2008, he made headlines with the previously unheard of budget of $6.5 million USD ("Arráncame la vida"). Summarily, that means that Mexican films on a whole are produced on budgets equivalent to what in the US would be called "low" to "no" budget. Further, the barriers to entry into the US market are staggering for

foreign-language films, so most films produced in Mexico, besides suffering at times from the usual limitations of low-budget filmmaking, also face the difficulty of recouping on production and post-production investments. It is understandable from a distribution perspective to discuss an "indie" set of strategies vs. Hollywood, in which explicit differences at the level of material conditions of production do not matter as much as delineating a space for non-Hollywood content to be distributed. In this manner, whether a film is from the US or elsewhere, if it fits the marketability parameters of "indie" film, its success may open the door for others in similar veins. However, this conflation can serve to elide differences that do matter to the stakeholders on the ground, especially to the artists and funders behind any given film.

FILM FESTIVALS: THE MOVE TOWARDS INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT

To return to Sundance as film festival, it has served no small role as curator and exhibitor in cultivating and setting criteria for what counts as quality US independent film, as well as serving as launching ground for international films that may find distribution in "indie" circuits in the US. Festivals worldwide also remain important in setting art cinema trends, including those as mentioned above. Scholarship on film festivals has only recently found traction in the academy; a few scholars have considered festivals as alternate exhibition circuits or in terms of art or national cinema histories, and have discussed them, for example, in contexts of representation or discovery of new talent. However, until now, journalism, film criticism, industry trade publications, institutional or other memoirs, and publications by festivals have traditionally represented the field. Over the past few years, academics have begun to collect festival information and histories, and present them systematically and analytically.

As a burgeoning field, reviewable largely thanks to the organizing efforts of Marijke de Valck, Skadi Lost, and Dina Iordanova, its strengths so far appear to be in: (1) analyzing the roles various organizations play in shaping the festival circuit, especially in terms of whose interests are being more or less met by the institutional players; (2) discussing the roles of cinephilia and/or popular interests (including spectacle) in shaping festival film selection, funding, and attendance; (3) analyzing film festivals and their relationship to (or building of) imagined communities, from the national and diasporic interests and stakeholders, to the idea of the global film festival community; (4) considering festivals as agents of activism, specifically those who curate programs in support of especially marginalized filmmakers, and subject matter aimed at social change; and (5) analyzing film festivals as historical agents in general, shaping discourse around history, meaning, politics, what is and is not cinema, relevant cinema, auteur cinema, avant-garde cinema, etc.

The main purview so far of film festival studies is engaged in analyzing festivals as exhibitors—that is, what they exhibit and why (curatorial process); for whom, where, under what conditions; and with what results for the audience, filmmakers, nation or other interest groups. Sometimes how festivals are funded comes into the analytical picture, inasmuch as that may influence the previous sets of what, why and the like. The handful of studies so far on markets privilege sales markets, that is analyzing forums created for the post-production sales of films. This makes sense, as film festivals historically have existed and built their reputations by the films they select to screen, the stars in attendance, and then as venues through which films may get picked up for formal distribution. Chris Gore's Ultimate Film Festival Survival Guide in its various editions has highlighted these aspects as they relate practically to filmmakers. Based on personal experience, and series of interviews with filmmakers who have found success through

festivals and with festival programmers, Gore outlined a number of strategies geared towards filmmakers finding the right type of festival for their films, and maximizing that participation. Strong festivals stand out as (1) curators of quality cinema programming within their niche commitments, (2) hosts to national and international stars and recognized industry talent, and (3) platforms for press visibility, especially industry trades, that track the movers and shakers of the film world. He also emphasized that attending a festival is as much about networking for future projects, as it is about being present for the film that got you there.

However, what is largely missing from both the academic studies and the industry guides is an analytical investigation of the ways that specific festivals have stepped up over the past couple of decades in a particular way to address Hollywood's reluctance to take risk and its relentlessly "commercial" orientation. Festivals have begun to serve as investors in mentoring filmmakers, as facilitators for young filmmakers' greater access to major players in the film community, and even as funders in some cases of actual films. The leaders in this regard have been the Sundance Institute and the Hubert Bals Fund (HBF). The Sundance Institute was established in 1981 prior to its association with the United States Film Festival. The Institute took over the festival and changed the festival's name to the Sundance Film Festival in the early 1990s. The Institute holds Labs annually that foster a variety of projects, especially independent films. The HBF was established to support art cinema at the development, post-production, and distribution phases. Hubert Bals founded the Rotterdam Film Festival in 1971, and was the visionary behind the fund named for him. Unfortunately he died in 1988, the same year the fund was officially approved, and did not live to see the results of his efforts. However since then, it remains a major leader in its support of global South films and filmmakers.

With the exception of Sundance, to date, initiatives of this nature have been largely spearheaded by European cultural entitles interested in actively supporting art cinema/world cinema. The HBF, for example, explicitly supports films at all levels of development through post production and even sometimes distribution, but the films they back must originate from a developing country and be produced in that country. Their second highest criterion is that the films funded exhibit artistic quality as judged by the review committee. The funds have made major impacts in supporting filmmakers, including in Latin America. Other major European funds and festival initiatives have benefitted Mexican film as part of Latin America. These include the CineMart film co-production market launched in 1983 at the International Film Festival Rotterdam (IFFR), the Rotterdam Lab begun in 2001, the Berlinale Talent Campus begun in 2003, the Berlinale World Cinema Fund founded in 2004, the Berlinale Co-Production Market launched in 2004, the Producers Network at Cannes inaugurated in 2004, the Cinéfondation Residence Program at Cannes launched in 2000, and the "Cine en Construcción" (Films in Progress) joint-venture founded in 2002 between the San Sebastián Film Festival in Spain and the Latin American Film Festival in Toulouse, France (Ross; Falicov).

With the above in mind, a continued turn from summary to analysis is necessary. Few contemporary studies exist yet that directly address the issues at the heart of this dissertation. However, there are scholars whose work is relevant and useful to these discussions. In the following sections, I propose a series of theoretical frameworks as well as methodological approaches for completing this study.

THEORY: NATIONAL CINEMA, FILM FESTIVALS, AND INDUSTRIAL STAKEHOLDERS

As the previous sections have indicated, the major concern of this dissertation is an analysis of contemporary trends in Mexican cinema production, especially where these intersect with the maturation of three major film festivals in Mexico. My interest is inspired by trends in the past few years, of national film production and co-production, that seem to hold promise for the future. Structurally, this means considering Mexican cinema, and the festivals invested in supporting its development, in relation to theories of globalization and national cinemas. Mexican filmmakers experience particular possibilities and constraints in this age of conglomerate Hollywood, but are also buoyed at times by film cycles operating at the edges or outside of Hollywood. These alternatives include primarily the American independent film movement and its style of auteur-oriented filmmakers, and what has come to be known as European and other art cinema cycles, all of which are explicitly supported by a variety of international film festivals. The role of festivals in the contemporary age, the discourse surrounding them, and the ways in which festival coordinators negotiate local, national, and transnational interests are lenses that may be used to approach their study.

The term globalization, especially in film studies, is often linked to the juggernaut of Hollywood, its national dominance, and wide-spread international reach. This is likely because of the mobilization of the majors within corporations in the age of conglomeration. In his analysis of corporate trends in the 1990s, Tino Balio writes, "As described by Time Warner, globalization dictated that the top players in the business develop long-term strategies to build on a strong base of operations at home while achieving 'a major presence in all of the world's important markets'" (206). The conflation is also linked to the fact that globalization as theoretical concept arose out of a scholarly tradition that had framed Hollywood and related US media as imperialistic. In

his article "Thinking Globally: From Media Imperialism to Media Capital," Michael Curtin describes the trajectory of globalization theory and ultimately proposes a three-pronged approach, one that posits globalization as a dynamic as opposed to hegemonic force. His approach also rejects the idea of a core or "authentic national culture," and the privileging of "indigenous culture," as it recognizes that cultural interchange both within and across borders is fact of human experience (110). Rather than a top-down approach lamenting how weak national industries are relative to Hollywood, Curtin proposes that cultural industries be evaluated according to a particular application of the term "media capital."

As Curtin conceives of it, any discussion of "media capital" must recognize that while Hollywood cinema (or other dominant industries like Bollywood and Hong Kong) is certainly powerful and its output diffused widely, other regional and national cinemas are not voiceless or invisible. In fact, they exist in conversation with and make incursions of their own into global culture. Fundamental to the theory proposed, media capital can be evaluated by: (1) considering how media industries accumulate resources and commodities; (2) understanding how creative migration takes place and its effects on media industry and labor; and (3) recognizing sociocultural variation, especially how institutions intervene in cultural markets (112-16). Looking at media industries through these lenses, Curtin argues, "encourages us to provide dynamic and historicized accounts that delineate the operations of capital and the migrations of talent, while at the same time directing our attention to forces and contingencies that give shape to spheres of cultural exchange" (117). Basically, Curtin's approach offers possibilities for application to the case studies here, by first recognizing the ways in which Mexican filmmakers, production companies, and government institutions generate, value, and circulate films. Second, by keeping in mind that cultural and labor flows inform what resources are available, and

recognizing that Mexican filmmakers may work in regional, national or international contexts. Finally, by identifying the invested institutions and what is at stake for them, in this case that would include government organizations like IMCINE and CONACULTA, the film festivals FICG, GIFF, and FICM, and the initiatives that each undertakes with respect to the Mexican film industry.

For its part, Mexican cinema history and analyses have to date been focused on typical areas of film studies research, including filmographies, industry histories, genre analyses, textual and thematic analyses, political analyses, star studies, representation and identity issues, and delineating trends in all of these veins. Scholars like those mentioned and consulted to complete the "Mexican Film History" section above, including Chon Noriega, Charles Ramirez Berg, Carl J. Mora, Joanne Herschfield, David R. Maciel, Jorge Ayala Blanco, Carlos Monsiváis, and Elissa Rashkin, have all contributed to articles and monographs as part of the overarching studies and understanding of Mexican cinema as it has evolved since its inception. An predominant concern for scholars is the way that films produced constitute a Mexican national cinema, and further, what filmmakers have to say about their country through their films. As evidenced by titles like Cinema of Solitude (Berg), La fugacidad del cine mexicano (The Fugacity of Mexican Cinema, Ayala Blanco), "Intimate Connections: Cinematic Allegories of Gender, the State, and National Identity" (Saragoza and Berkovich), Mexican Cinema: Reflections of a Society (Mora), and Women Filmmakers in Mexico: The Country of Which We Dream (Rashkin), to name just a few, Mexican cinematic history in academia is intimately linked with textual analysis in socio-historical context.

The idea of a Mexican national cinema is often organized around competing thematic elements, such as modernity vs. the past (including indigenous pasts), urban vs. rural, masculine vs. feminine. In many cases, the first of these binaries is the privileged of

the two; however, as scholars have demonstrated—including Berg, Rashkin, and Mora—indigenous issues, rural settings and conflicts, feminine perspectives, as well as other marginalized themes and voices, have found their places at times in the national cinematic panorama. The institutions and audiences that show support for Mexican cinema, and under what conditions, are also part of the story. This includes within Mexico, as part of Latin American cinema, in relation with the US, and also to what extent films reach audiences outside of Spanish-language audiences. For example, in John King's and Gaizka S. Usabel's work, as well as Noriega's edited work Latin American Cinema, Mexico's cinema is analyzed as part of the Americas. At times, local audiences are the focus; at other times allegiances with Latin America and the US seem more significant, such that films reach audiences outside of Mexico. Both of these trajectories have been important to the formation of a national cinema because, since its inception, Mexican cinema has had to contend with the influx of films from Latin America and Hollywood. This is true especially with Hollywood, in terms of volume, but also in terms of content, as Hollywood has developed its own versions of representing Mexico and Mexicans within its filmographies.

As Noriega points out in "Mexican Cinema in the United States," the study of Mexican film necessitates a willingness to evaluate it in all of its complexity as a "significant mode of Mexican self-representation" (1, emphasis in original). This approach is in line with the model of globalization that Curtin proposes, in that it seeks to recognize and validate what Mexican films bring to the table without essentializing them, nor through lamenting their difference. At the core, Noriega argues, "Mexican cinema reveals how an industry, closely aligned with the state, has represented Mexico to itself, to the Spanish-speaking world, and to international 'art film' audiences" (1). Noriega also frames his approach by arguing that the evaluation of these points of contact (national

and international, audiences and critics) requires that we recognize that discourse surrounding Mexican cinema is distinct based on the setting of its circulation. He points to how films lose national specificity when they cross borders, a process that "both adds to and subtracts from the original text" (4). I would compliment this with Tom O'Regan's discussions in his article "A National Cinema," as he articulates the ways in which national cinemas must negotiate identity and politics both at home and abroad.

Both Noriega and O'Regan point to how many films that are popular or successful at home are distinct from those that are successful abroad; this necessarily complicates national audiences' perspective on the films that are associated with their country on the international stage. O'Regan further details how filmmakers (outside of Hollywood) can find themselves bearing the weight of representing their country. That can be difficult to manage on top of trying to make a film that can generate box office at home, and/or circulate on the international film circuit, but it is a contemporary reality. As O'Regan writes, "national cinemas are an intrinsically international form" and correspondingly that "Every national cinema attempts at some point to turn its national distinction into an asset, not a liability" (155). To do so, filmmakers and national institutions must work together, to sustain film production and subsequently promote it in the forums most suited to support it. This framework seems especially suited for analysis of the cases detailed in upcoming chapters, as Mexican filmmakers must certainly balance their own personal artistic and professional goals with the interests of others invested in their work in particular, or the circulation of Mexican film in general.

Of prime importance to this study, contemporary Mexican cinema studies have not yet begun to systematically study film festivals. This is not surprising considering that film festival studies in academia are relatively recent undertakings. That fact that the major film festivals in Mexico are less than thirty-five years old likely adds to the

absence of attention. This does not mean that festivals are absent from the discussion entirely. Rather, they are incorporated into a broader conversation related to tracking where Mexican films and stars (especially directors and actors) have been circulating in general—festivals are referenced in order to bolster arguments that Mexico as a nation does produce cinema of quality, and talent that we should all keep an eye on. Works like Las rutas del cine mexicano contemporáneo 1990-2006 by Carla González Vargas illustrate this trend. As she discusses major works of the time period in question, she dedicates box space with bullet points to highlighting the accomplishments of certain films. For example, when discussing Profundo carmesí (Deep Crimson, 1996, Dir. Arturo Ripstein), in its box space, she notes its participation in major festivals including Sundance, awards won in those festivals, and the Mexican Ariels the film has won (143). However, throughout the book, the question of the significance of festivals is not interrogated; it is instead a structuring frame that the reader is expected to recognize as a valuable measuring stick for film success.

When we turn to festival history and theory, we encounter the trends noted above in "Film Festivals, 'Indie' Cinema, and the Cult of the Auteur." Additionally, it is important to note that Latin America as a whole is greatly underrepresented against other regions, especially Europe, Asia, and Africa. Even when Latin America is featured, for example in the article "Meeting Points: A Survey of Film Festivals in Latin America" by Carlos A. Gutiérrez and Monika Wagenberg, Mexico's festivals understandably—in terms of historical longevity and impact—only occupy a small fraction of the discussion. This means that Mexico's national film festivals are, overall, especially marginalized in film studies to date. Furthermore, analyses of initiatives like film markets, funding or other mentoring programs, are limited. The majority emphasis of film festival studies is concerned with the films and filmmakers championed in the film program sections of the

festivals, and the corresponding cults of cinephilia and of the auteur. However, a few scholars have started looking at film festival markets and funds, including Cindy Hing-Yuk Wong, Daniel Steinhart, Tamara L. Falicov, and Miriam Ross. Each of them is concerned with exploring how markets function as a complimentary distribution network and/or how funds and related initiatives are forming new—and reshaping traditional—production networks. Of most relevance to this dissertation are the latter set of activities regarding funds and mentoring programs. The general "pros" these authors identify are that filmmakers are being supported who might otherwise not be able to build or further their career; furthermore most of the programs explicitly target nations from the global South, helping to develop, at least in theory, a greater range of diversity within international film offerings. The "cons" may be summed up as a concern that the funders and mentors are directly impacting not only which artists' projects gets funded or supported, but by extension the trajectory of the national cinemas behind them. Whether conscientiously or as a byproduct of their cultural formations, European funders pick and champion projects that fit their ideas of artistic excellence, and applicants are therefore encouraged to meet those standards. The gatekeeper concern is a valid one, and these scholars provide lenses through which to discuss those parameters.

A counter to the above noted "con" has been proposed throughout this essay: consideration of how national cinema stakeholders, including institutions and filmmakers, act as agents on behalf of their own interests within the systems in play. Two articles in particular from the collection Film Festival Yearbook 1: The Festival Circuit, edited by Dina Iordanova and Ragan Rhyne are helpful in this regard. The first, "Film Festival Circuits and Stakeholders" by Rhyne provides a useful model for analyzing non-profit film festivals as agents in the cultural industries. She argues for a methodology that

takes into account how festivals function within the "larger networks of cultural policy, governance and global capitalism" (21). Rhyne's model is founded on the argument that:

> Film festivals are not just one example of the institutionalisation of cultural management through the non-profit model; far more they are the perfect example of the ways that these policies are enacted, though unevenly distributed, to link cultural labour, governance and commerce toward a common goal. (15)

She proposes that the stakeholders in this cultural milieu be categorized as follows: "1) filmmakers and producers, 2) journalists, 3) the film industry of financiers, lawyers, distributors and studios, 4) tourist and ancillary industries, 5) policymakers, funders, and festival managers" (17). This is a very good starting off place to consider who has what at stake within the nexus of the film festival world. In order to focus in on the most relevant stakeholders for this dissertation's analyses, I will be most concerned with the following categories of people or institutions who invest their time and/or money in film festivals:

- Festival and "industry" leadership and coordinators
- Directors / writers / producers (who participate in "behind the screens" or "industry" activities)
- Industry participants including sponsors, distributors, sales agents, and the like who attend festival and/or "industry" activities
- Filmmakers (whose films screen as part of the festival's "front of house" activities)
- Journalists and critics
- Partnering national and international cultural organizations

While other stakeholders that Rhyne identifies are certainly important, for example tourist industries, they remain outside of the purview of this present project. In coordination with Curtin's model, and with other considerations mentioned in this section, Rhyne's framework provides a complimentary tool for analyzing some of the key

investors in the film festival world, and by extension, the sustenance of films as creative and industrial products.

The second article from Film Festival Yearbook 1 is by Charles-Clemens Rüling, entitled "Festivals as Field-configuring Events: The Annecy International Animated Film Festival and Market." In it, Rüling corroborates my general observation that research on film festivals does not often take into account the organizational processes and the institutional logics behind how they operate (50-51). He argues that the concept of "field-configuring events" is useful for analyzing film festivals as organizations. Rüling cites previous research, outlining:

> Field-configuring events are "temporary social organizations such as tradeshows, professional gatherings, technology contests and business ceremonies that encapsulate and shape the development of professions, technologies, markets, and industries ... They are settings in which people from diverse organizations and with diverse purposes assemble periodically, or on a one-time basis, to announce new products, develop industry standards, construct social networks, recognize accomplishments, share and interpret information, and transact business." (51)[33]

Events significant to a particular field are those recognized by the movers and shakers as relevant to their organization in the above-named areas: networks, technologies, standards, accomplishments, etc. Significant events are the "must attend" events, serving as points and places in time where these very concerns are debated as well as formulated, by those who organize the events as well as by those who attend. Rüling applies this model to the Annecy Festival and Market, extending it to illustrate how that festival and market's organizers have strategically established themselves as players in the field, namely as "an industry actor" attracting key attendees yearly (61-64). This provides another useful theoretical concept that can help to describe and analyze what is

[33] To explain the quotes within quote, this selection is cited as being from a 2008 article by Lampel and Meyer; the corresponding article does not appear to be included in Rüling's Works Cited list.

happening organizationally at FICG, GIFF, and FICM, as well as why they might attract the attendees that they do.

Ultimately, whether a festival is able to establish itself up as a "must attend" event, and what tone it sets in doing so, influences its reach in terms of who will be attracted to attend. This extends to the industry initiative areas as well. All festivals work to develop a reputation, usually related to a founding mission, including the three Mexican festivals at the heart of this investigation. The significance of these major festivals to the national cinema infrastructure in recent years may best be illustrated by reviewing the 2010 and 2011 Statistical Yearbooks by IMCINE. Notably, between the publications in 2010 and 2011, the number of pages devoted explicitly to festival information and statistics jumped from four pages to nine. Pertaining to the 2011 edition of the yearbook, the three festivals FICG, FICM, and GIFF are highlighted separately in the introductory section as the "three main festivals in the country" (44). Further, they are featured in a statistical survey section evaluating perceived festival impacts on areas including local employment, local tourism, film talent development (including actors/actresses and producers), overall industry improvement, film promotion, and international projection (54-57). To meet the challenges of the contemporary international film festival world, festivals not only have to be recognized as significant within their home territories, but also extend their reach of influence and exchange into other regions, which—as will be discussed in upcoming chapters—each of these festivals has managed to do. This project's next section and subsequent chapters have as their primary focus an analysis of the contexts and interests at play when these three Mexican festivals leveraged their individual reputations to make the move from primarily exhibition outlets to institutions overtly supporting national film production.

MEXICAN FILM HISTORY, FILM FESTIVALS, AND INDUSTRY RENOVATION

The historical and analytical frames previewed to this point have covered a number of fields, including Mexican film history, major studio versus independent development models, art cinema and auteur theory, alternate exhibition and distribution circuits, media capital flows and globalization, and film festival agency in taste making and in industry innovation. The array of considerations is due to the state of the art, as it were, where international film festivals operate in full awareness of the complexity of local and global media interests, and successful festivals are those that are recognized for their influence on the world cinema circuit. The nexus that provides focus for the present set of inquiries is the relationships between film festivals and film production, a connection not historically at the forefront of film festival or film industry studies. Film festivals originated as alternate exhibition sites, aligned with carving out spaces for non-Hollywood or other non-commercial cinemas. Traditionally festivals have supported independent and avant-garde voices, setting many of the benchmarks for what circulates discursively in the categories of radical, revolutionary, quality, auteur, and/or art cinema. Festivals designing and hosting initiatives that overtly support films in development or early production is a recent phenomenon in world festival trends, and one that the major Mexican festivals FICG, GIFF, and FICM picked up on in the early 2000s. This area of film festivals is not well studied and therefore not well understood; yet it is an important—even vital—part of the film development landscape, especially in regions like the global South, where industry resources may be underdeveloped and funds scarce.

Because this project initially began with the intent to study most closely the IPM in Guanajuato (the first of the case study initiatives to launch, in Summer 2004), the Encuentro in Guadalajara (second, in Spring 2005), and the Lab in Morelia (third, in Fall 2005), the upcoming chapters run in this order. However, it is important to note that this

is not the order of the founding of each of the festivals, where FICG is the longest running, GIFF next in line, and FICM the most recent. The decision to cover the festival histories in depth in this project resulted from the discovery of how little backstory there was to refer to; in order to analyze connections between Mexican film history and Mexican film festival industry initiatives, the story of the festivals themselves needed to be told. Additionally, it became clear that an important part of this story were the ways in which the festivals were responding to the industry's ups and downs, first as exhibitors opening up screen space to national films, and subsequently as industry actors attempting to invigorate Mexican production through their industry initiatives. Although my motivational focus remains on attention to historicizing and analyzing the industry initiatives, the second part of the story could not be told in the absence of the first. The festivals each started out, in their own ways, as Mexican showcases; they did so because they each believed that national cinema needed to connect with audiences. The founders of the festivals were not ignorant of the waves of crisis within Mexican filmmaking history, in fact it imbued their institutional missions with purpose. Because of their commitment to supporting national cinema, the festivals tried to address the crises with the means available to them, deploying resources towards curating film selections, inviting noted guests, hosting parallel activities (panels, concerts, art shows, or the like), and ultimately including initiatives aimed at reinvigorating film production. As upcoming chapters illustrate, the festivals' efforts both exposed and aimed to address weaknesses in the Mexican film industry, specifically at the level of closed production networks that traditionally kept out newcomers, which had resulted in limited training opportunities for producers and restricted funding resources for independent productions, all of which was crippling the industry from the ground up.

Each of the three Mexican festivals has its own trajectory and identity; each chapter that follows explores a festival from its founding through the early years of the 2010s, after the industry initiatives had each been running for a few years. The first festival to be covered is GIFF in Chapter 4. From its founding, EEC/GIFF has cultivated a reputation of being on the cutting edge of a changing cinema landscape; it overtly championed new formats for production and exhibition, especially video and digital works when they were considered non-professional formats, and actively sought youth, outsider, and marginalized voices to include in its programs. In Chapter 5, we tackle FICG, which grew out of an alliance that brought academic, cinephile, and independent filmmaking interests to bear. The founders aimed to legitimize Mexican contributions to auteur and art cinema film cycles, and to create an intellectual environment around film exhibition in general. As it evolved over the years, FICG continued to promote itself as a festival with an eye on world trends, and positioned its programs as bringing together top national and international auteurs, film students, scholars, and film critics. The third festival of this study, FICM, is profiled in Chapter 6. Although FICM is younger in terms of years compared to FICG and GIFF, the programming experience and industry connections that the founding team brought to the table meant that it kicked off already connected to the world stage. Firmly anchored in promoting Mexican film, the festival coordination and programming also aligned itself from the beginning with prestigious collaborators including the International Critics' Week; FICM has consistently projected the image of a premier festival in program and guests. Each festival's profile is comprised of a complex interplay of what they aspire to, with what they are able to achieve, and with who takes notice and in what contexts. The first sections of Chapters 4 through 6 elaborate on the above festival profiles, in particular the ways that each has

developed its exhibition slates over the years and corresponding "front of house" activities.

From their vantage point as film curators, in touch with independent and new voices through calls for entries and scouting for content for their annual events, film festivals are situated industry-wise in a place where they are in direct contact with filmmakers who are especially vulnerable and hungry for recognition. Filmmakers are competing for visibility in a world where many aspects of filmmaking are democratizing—video production is cheaper and more accessible than ever before and DIY distribution outlets also abound—while competition for theatrical or other exhibition screen space is crowded, often as a result of that very democratization. Unknown filmmakers can face great odds when trying to break into any established distribution or exhibition circuit, including into film festival lineups, as festivals sift through a great deal of material and have many considerations to take into account when finalizing selection. As one of those considerations, festivals compete with each other to find and book top tier and innovative content that distinguishes them on the circuit, especially but not only when they're in the same country, as FICG, GIFF, and FICM are. Festival programmers track national and international trends, and as such, they know where hot spots and weak spots are in the industry; when festivals have niche-specific missions their attention is tuned in to those areas especially.

All three festivals started out with missions to support national cinema by exhibiting it. They were each founded in different decades, in different political environments, and faced their own challenges as they got off the ground. In the case of FICG and GIFF, they experienced growing pains as they learned to transcend local concerns and begin to compete in the global market; FICM had an advantage in terms of festival direction in that the founding director, Daniela Michel, already came to the

festival with years of curatorial experience and connections. That said, the three festivals evolved over the years in response to changes in the industry at national and international levels, as well as in response to directions the other festivals were heading. The second part of each upcoming chapter is devoted to detailing one of the most important ways the festivals stepped up their games in support of national cinema: moving beyond exhibition and adding "behind the screens" activities. The activities profiled specifically address one area of weakness in Mexican cinema of the early 2000s, which each festival was acutely aware of—namely, that the Mexican film industry was in dire need of professional producers in order to recover and rebuild.

Years of being tied to the whims of presidential terms, entrenched and corrupt funding models, and unevenly supported industrial infrastructure, had resulted in a weak national cinema. As we shall see in upcoming chapters, creativity was not at issue, neither was talent; for example, there were plenty of directors, writers, and cinematographers. However, people who knew the business of making films, how to go through development, how to design a project to have a chance to reach audiences, how to connect to resources both within and beyond Mexico's borders, i.e. professional producers, were in very short supply. The festivals intervened by expanding their support from exhibition into new territory, trying out innovative ways of training producers that, by design, also included interjecting them into existing networks of professionals. In addition to describing the initial years of each profiled activity, the IPM at EEC/GIFF, the Encuentro at FICG, and Morelia Lab at FICM, each chapter includes the perspective of a few producers and directors who participated in the events. Analyses take into account such first-hand observations in compliment to broader contexts, with an eye towards considering to what extent the festivals have contributed to the rejuvenation of the national film scene, especially since the inception of their industry interventions.

Ultimately, their accomplishments are interrelated and have helped shape a generation of filmmakers, many of whom are connected professionally in Mexico and beyond, and who, hopefully, are capable of continuing to produce films into the future even as they face new challenges.

To recap and set the stage for the rest of this project, each upcoming chapter is dedicated to one of the three festival, and works through the following in this order: (1) overview of the festival's history and analysis of its trajectory in terms of profile and reach; (2) context for the festival's decision to incorporate industry activities, and exploration of a representative initiative; (3) two film case studies, of films that went through the respective initiative and have since been completed; (4) analyses and conclusions. The festivals decisions to diversify their role in the national film landscape reveal complexities in the interdependence of festivals and filmmakers beyond what had historically been the case, where festivals served exhibition and promotion roles with respect to completed films. Analysis of this move into industry reveals a dual strategy of an interdependent or even synergistic relationship between festival and filmmakers. The success of participating filmmakers and renovation of national cinema is integral to the reputation of the festival; in turn, a high-profile reputation allows the festival to continue to attract resources to itself (e.g., sponsors, collaborators, industry attendees) that may be brought to bear to support the next round of films and filmmakers going through its industry initiatives. This leads us into the exploration of how this has worked for the Mexican festivals GIFF, FICG, and FICM, beginning with Guanajuato and the International Pitching Market.

Chapter 4: Guanajuato: "Expresión en Corto" and Mexico's First International Pitching Market

> We have a lot of very talented filmmakers in Mexico, photographers, writers, directors, actors. And I think that we have a responsibility to create and support and "fomentar" Mexican filmmakers. I think as a country we have a responsibility to use this great wealth of talent to influence the future of world cinema.
> - Sarah Hoch, founder and director of Expresión en Corto/GIFF[34]

Since the height of its Golden Age, Mexican cinema and its practitioners have gone through waves of innovation and retrenchment, with a common theme of struggling to reach audiences on their own screens in their own country, and even more so to build a following and national industry with international reach. The history of Guanajuato International Film Festival (GIFF) begins in the late 1990s, during the one of Mexican film industry's biggest collapses since its inception. GIFF formed initially as a short film and documentary film festival named "Expresión en Corto" (EEC) in 1998.[35] From the vantage point of the state of Guanajuato, the founder and director of EEC Sarah Hoch Delong had observed that the primary forms of filmmaking at the time, since feature production was in crisis, were in short films, especially those produced out of the national film schools. However with limited screen space, almost all of which was devoted to Hollywood box office features, viewers did not have access to vibrant, national films. EEC started out with mostly Mexican films, all short form, and would expand selection in its early years and begin including longer form documentary films. As it evolved, EEC included international selections while continuing to prioritize inclusion of Mexican films

---

[34] Sarah Hoch, personal interview, 04 Apr. 2013.

The verb "fomentar" is a little difficult to translate which is why I have left it in Spanish, as Sarah Hoch said it in Spanish during the interview—overall, the interview was conducted in English. In this context it may be understood as meaning "to promote," "to encourage" and even "to stimulate" in the sense of motivating filmmakers to become active.

[35] The name Expresión en Corto (EEC) is a play on words of sorts, as "Corto" means "short" as in the length of any object, and also it means "short film." The festival's name can be translated awkwardly as "Short Expressions," "Expressions in Short Form" or "Expressions in Short Film," but Expresión en Corto as an organization is always referred to as such, in Spanish.

in its programs, in both competitive and non-competitive sections. In 2011, the festival officially changed names to the Guanajuato International Film Festival (GIFF), with its non-profit branch still named Expresión en Corto.

Significantly, Hoch also founded the Comisión de Filmaciones del Estado de Guanajuato (The State Film Commission of Guanajuato) in 1997, and served as its director until 2010. She established both the Film Commission and the non-profit Expresión en Corto in 1997, and organized the first EEC Film Festival in 1998, with the stated intent to use both to attract film production to Mexico (Hoch Interviews). This two-pronged approach to establishing new film institutions in the state of Guanajuato, one anchored to creativity and the business of film production and one in independent exhibition—is distinct from the other two festivals studied in this project. While all three festivals were founded with an eye on providing a much-needed opportunity for audiences to view Mexican films on the big screen, each was founded in a different decade and each has developed its own identity in national and international contexts. The Guadalajara International Film Festival (FICG, Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara) was founded in 1986 as a showcase for Mexican films. As will be discussed in upcoming sections and in Chapter 5, FICG from its inception has cultivated a reputation for providing space for appreciating and evaluating films, in academic and critical contexts, in large part because of its close relationship with the University of Guadalajara. The Morelia International Film Festival (FICM, Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia) launched in 2003 as a forum for Mexican films, and has built its reputation on providing a gala-style and celebratory atmosphere with stars and press in attendance. We return to FICM in more detail in Chapter 6, as well as by comparison later in this chapter, as we continue here with EEC.

Over the years the festival Expresión en Corto has favored an outsider and edgy vibe, including in staying devoted to screening short film selections in all formats, complimented by feature selections. It has pushed boundaries and taken risks with its lineups, for example inviting provocateurs as guests of honor, including filmmakers Oliver Stone and Kenneth Anger, dancer and actor Yolanda Montes "Tongolele," and photographer Spencer Tunick, to name a few examples. Setting the tone with its offerings, which has included showcases of erotic art, screenings of underground cinema, or selections of previously censored films, EEC/GIFF also cultivated a reputation for supporting new and avant-garde voices.

During the 7th annual EEC in July of 2004, as a response to the continued crisis in national feature production, the festival hosted the first ever International Pitching Market (IPM) in Mexico in Guanajuato Capital. The IPM brought together 20 Mexican-helmed projects to meet with national and international producers, distributors, and exhibitors, for private pitch sessions. In this context, a "pitch" consists of the opportunity for a filmmaker to present a film project in development to potential collaborators. One of the biggest challenges the Mexican industry was facing was a lack of professional producers, i.e. people who knew how to package and pitch a project for investors, which, as will be discussed later in this chapter, resulted in a steep learning curve for those involved. The event marked an open acknowledgement that the Mexican film industry needed to turn a corner from old habits and stagnant networks, and learn to compete in the global market. For the first few years of the IPM, producers (or would-be producers) learned primarily on the fly; over time, as the Mexican industry matured and other institutions also responded with their initiatives, the notion of pitching became less foreign, and professional producers less of an anomaly.

Since its inception, the main visionary force behind the festival and associated activities like the IPM has been Hoch, who has surrounded herself with others who shared her guiding principles: to draw national attention and resources towards boosting film production in Mexico and coproduction of Mexican film with other countries. This chapter examines the history and evolving nature of Expresión en Corto to GIFF and is divided into four main sections. The first provides a historical overview of EEC/GIFF as a festival, including its trajectory, growth, and initiatives, from its first edition in 1998 through its fourteenth year in 2011, and considering how the festival has achieved its status as a field-configuring event for stakeholders. The second discusses the origins of the IPM and the general organization of the event from 2004 through 2011, as an extension of the festival's goals to support Mexican filmmakers and film production.[36] The third undertakes two film production case studies: La Ticla / Amar a morir (2009, Love 'Till Death, Dir. Fernando Lebrija) whose filmmaking partners participated in the third IPM in 2006; and La brújula la lleva el muerto (2011, The Compass Is Carried by the Dead Man, Dir. Arturo Pons) whose director and producer participated in the fourth IPM in 2007. These cases illustrate some aspects of the complex nature of film development, including project financing and production, especially in the context of the early 2000s in Mexico. Finally, the fourth section is comprised of conclusions and thoughts on further research directions.

All of these discussions serve to analyze film festivals as industry agents, from a view behind the curtain or, as I prefer to designate it, "behind the screens." By "behind the screens" I specifically mean taking into consideration elements of both the film festival and film industry worlds that are not typically part of the limelight and spectacle

[36] While some comments and illustrative examples may include festival information for more recent years, the main purview of the study in terms of festival years and the International Pitching Market runs through 2011, for consistency across dissertation chapters.

of “front of house” engagement with audiences. During a film festival, the particularly invisible nature of most industry activities often keeps them shrouded in exclusivity and, in some cases, mystery. There is good reason for this: not everyone cares what goes on in the “back of house.” As illustrated in introductory Chapter 3, film festivals’ “front of house” engagement with the public is about screenings and associated spectacle, where completed films and smiling faces abound, ready for their show on the big screen. The elision of the complex industrial processes behind the completion of films is a big part of sustaining the celebratory nature of a festival. However, this also obscures the work necessary to realize a film, the fact that most film ideas never reach an audience, and the recognition that those that do are the products of substantial investment by many players along the way.

As EEC/GIFF and other festivals in Mexico create and maintain initiatives to support film production, they do so from a particular perspective, distinct from other training or support systems, such as academic study or studio apprenticeship. Therefore, this chapter aims to analyze EEC/GIFF on its terms, as a film festival and non-profit cultural entity, but without losing sight of the bigger industrial pictures, national settings, and international contexts of which is it a part. The theoretical frames introduced in preceding chapters provide lenses through which to analyze EEC/GIFF’s trajectory, and subsequently the intersection of IPM participation with the production timelines of the two case study films Amar a morir and La brújula. The case studies in this chapter, together with upcoming case studies in Chapters 5 and 6, illustrate a number of ways in which a long-term perspective is essential to analyzing the success or failure of any given initiative, whether talking about a film project, or a film festival industry area. Ragan Rhyne’s model in which festival stakeholders work to create and maintain institutional relevancy in the circuit, is especially pertinent to contextualizing EEC/GIFF’s strategies

over the years in programming and guests. Application of Charles-Clemens Rüling's use of "field-configuring events" to film festival and market organization is useful in considering ways that EEC/GIFF has attempted expand its influence by adding parallel activities to its line-up, targeted at attracting a wider range of industry players to them than would attend festival screenings alone. Together, these point to ways in which EEC/GIFF has leveraged resources towards building a regional center of influence in dialogue with national and international film scenes. Analysis along these lines is informed by Michael Curtin's model of media capital and media capitals as one of multidirectional flows, in which EEC/GIFF's aspirations to influence the trajectory of Mexican cinema is grounded in aiming to bolster its profile in both domestic and foreign markets.

As will be discussed in upcoming sections, during the period from 1998 to 2011, EEC/GIFF built a reputation as a festival willing to take risks by programming celebrated filmmakers and films that pushed boundaries in subject matter and form, and one that promoted Mexican films and filmmakers as anchors of all festival programming. A crucial addition to this came in 2004, when the festival, building on that reputation, launched the country's first International Pitching Market, a venue in which Mexican filmmakers had the opportunity to meet with invited national and international potential investors. This event would become an anchor of related festival activities aimed at supporting filmmakers, by offering structured opportunities for them to extend their networks and access to possible investors.

While it remains to be seen what long-term analysis will reveal about the IPM, initial study indicates some benchmarks that could be used to evaluate "success" or "failure," both of the event itself as an institutional activity, as well as with regards to filmmakers' experiences as they navigate any given production. Filmmaker expectations

may be geared towards closing deals at the IPM, while in most cases, realizing this expectation for the majority of participants is not borne out by current evidence. Instead, as part of the production cycle of a film, and ideally the continued viability of a completed film to reach audiences, the IPM is best analyzed as one of many opportunities that filmmakers may seek to participate in as they work on their projects. Analytical benchmarks primarily include considering to what extent the activities of the IPM served to (1) create additional spaces for networking and opportunities for professionalization of attendees and (2) provide a platform for project representatives to present their work to national and international industry players. These two benchmarks are in line with the overall film business model of development, in which more projects exist as ideas than will ever get made—the idea is that quality will sift up and out of the pool. Without actual production financing or studio infrastructure to offer to Mexican filmmakers, what the IPM could provide was the chance for selected filmmakers to network with a good number of film industry players in a short amount of time, against the backdrop of an international film festival. The IPM as an initiative has also been influential in local and national strategies to support the professionalization of producers in the country during the 2000s.

Before delving in to the IPM, and corresponding filmmaker experiences there, this chapter starts with the initial historical section of the founding of EEC through its transformation into GIFF.

OVERVIEW: FROM "EXPRESIÓN EN CORTO" TO "GUANAJUATO INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL"

Although originally from the United States, festival founder and director Hoch has lived and worked in Mexico since the 1980s. She organized the first "Festival Internacional de Cine 'Expresión en Corto'" (EEC) in 1998, serving as its Executive

Director since then and overseeing its transformation into GIFF. The festival's trajectory may be described in two historical periods. The first of these is from 1998 to 2003, corresponding to the years preceding the first IPM. During the inaugural years from 1998 to 2000, the festival took place in only one of the cities of San Miguel de Allende or Guanajuato Capital; from 2001 to 2003, EEC expanded its programming missions and also began to split its dates between San Miguel and Guanajuato Capital. The second historical period covers 2004 into the early 2010s. During this timeframe, EEC inaugurated the IPM, and focused on related activities aimed at attracting members of the industry to the festival, including providing professional networking and training opportunities. By 2011, EEC had been rebranded as GIFF, and expanded Industry into a concrete section of the festival explicitly parallel to the exhibition sections (I use a capital "I" for Industry when referring to the particular events, activities, and organization that a festival—in this case EEC/GIFF—identifies as its "Industria" or "Industry" area, in contrast to its general film festival activities). I start this historical section by discussing the first historical period, which took place prior to the establishment of the IPM, and follow this with an overview of the festival trajectory during subsequent years.

Expresión en Corto Prior to the International Pitching Market, 1998 to 2003

The years of EEC that lead up to the establishment of the first IPM were consistent with the vision and commitments that continued to inform the festival in subsequent years. The festival's foundational editions may be discussed roughly two phases: 1998 through 2000 as a one-city event, and 2001 through 2003 as a two-city festival. The first editions of EEC, corresponding to the years 1998 and 1999, were held in San Miguel de Allende. San Miguel is a city in central Mexico, known for a rich international arts scene, including local and expatriate communities that contribute to

diverse cultural offerings. With a population under 200,000, the city's reputation for attracting foreign visitors and transplants can be a source of tension for local residents especially when the peso is weak against foreign currency, but overall the city projects a world-class reputation and relies on tourism to maintain it. Its architecture and history earned it the honor of becoming a United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage Site in 2008.

The reasons Hoch has cited for starting a film festival reflect interrelated concerns, connected to both production and to exhibition. Hoch self-identified as a producer, and also wanted to create opportunities for regional employment. She stated that in comparison to mining, which the state of Guanajuato is known for historically, film production was a clean business that could provide jobs. These considerations inspired her as director of the Guanajuato State Film Commission to promote film production in the state. This included her working with short film projects. Through this, Hoch got to know many filmmakers, including students, who found themselves stuck professionally. As illustrated in Chapter 2, due to the state of production in Mexico in the 1990s, it was difficult for filmmakers to find funding for feature films; due to the state of exhibition in Mexico at the time, there were few opportunities for audiences to see Mexican films, whether shorts or features. In fact, there were few cinemas at all in the state of Guanajuato, much less theaters equipped to screen movies in the city of San Miguel de Allende. Filmmakers expressed frustration that even if they completed films, there was no place to show them; Hoch was especially inspired by those who railed against the elite nature of most film festivals at the time, which prioritized features and also only screened 35mm (Hoch Interviews; Hoch, "Un largo camino").

Motivated by a partnership with MTV Road Rules to screen one of their episodes in San Miguel, and having been considering organizing a short film showcase already,

Hoch and her team launched a call for entries. In response to that 1998 call, the festival received 38 short films from Mexico and a couple through the MTV contacts (GIFF Website; Hoch, "Un largo camino"). Backed by Kodak and Estudios Churubusco, the first edition of EEC was able to include a competition with awards (Hoch, "Un largo camino"). In an interview, Hoch described the festival years in the late 1990s as small showcase of Mexican shorts, with a few guests in attendance, and remembers when the parties were so small they were entirely open to the public (Interview 2013). EEC's programming gained momentum as a film festival dedicated to showcasing primarily Mexican short films, with many of the films coming from film students at the Centro Universitario de Estudios Cinematográficos (University Center for Cinematographic Studies, or CUEC) and the Centro de Capacitación Cinematográfica (CCC).[37]

In 2000, after two years in San Miguel, the festival moved to Guanajuato Capital,[38] a university town and the capital of the state, located about an hour and a half by car from San Miguel de Allende. Also a tourist city and a UNESCO World Heritage Site, a little but not much bigger than San Miguel population-wise, Guanajuato Capital has a vibe of a younger crowd and is known for its night life. As for the festival, EEC's program was growing, and by the third year the selection was officially international, with films from Cuba, Canada, the US, Spain, Sweden, Chile and Mexico ("Exhiben trabajos 'cortos'"). The festival began to include a selection of documentaries, including the winning documentary short "Tortugas marinas" (1999, Dir. Juan E. García), and further committed itself to programming cutting-edge work from all over the world,

[37] Literally translated along the lines of the Center for Film Training, the school's name "Centro de Capacitación Cinematográfica" is rarely translated into English and is referred to as "el CCC" or "the CCC."

[38] In Spanish, the name of the city is Guanajuato, the same as the state of which it is capital city. To distinguish between city and state, the former is referred to as Guanajuato Capital (or, less commonly, Guanajuato City).

supporting exhibition of the especially marginalized forms of short film and documentaries (López Riestra; GIFF Website; Hoch 2004). Prior to 2000, the festival had accepted films in 35mm and video; from 2000 on they opened the call to as many formats as possible (Hoch, "Un largo camino"). Its program was multifaceted, with emphasis in three major areas: film screenings, conferences, and tributes.

Emblematic of a commitment to exhibiting and celebrating new trends in filmmaking, and explicitly fostering Mexican filmmakers, EEC's screenings in 2000 included some of the best-regarded Mexican shorts of the time, including "Coctel Molotov" ("Cocktail Molotov," 1999, Dir. José Angel García Moreno) and "Conejo" (1999, Dir. Francisco Vargas Quevedo). Additionally, EEC hosted the premieres of both Diminutos del Calvario (10 Minutes, 2000, Various Directors) and Así es la vida (Such Is Life, 2000, Dir. Arturo Ripstein). In 1999, Valentina Leduc's "La historia de I y O" ("Mr. I and Mrs. O") had won Best Short and recognition for Best Script, Art Direction, and Cinematography at EEC. With her prizes, which included 35mm film stock, camera rental, development and post, Leduc was inspired to oversee the creation of what would become Diminutos del Calvario, a project consisting of ten one-minute short films, each one take, each directed by a different person (Leduc, "Diminuitos de Calvario" 48). As for the premiere of Así es la vida, it marked the first film that the established Mexican director Arturo Ripstein had ever shot in digital video. It is also reportedly the first Latin American feature film, with release, that was shot in digital video and transferred to 35mm for projection (e.g. García, "Estrenan").

A tribute to the actor Alonso Echánove and a series of conferences with notable Mexican and international speakers rounded out the year 2000's festival offerings. To highlight a few: director Arturo Ripstein spoke on a panel entitled "El nuevo horizonte cinematográfico digital / Digital Cinema, the New Horizon"; Steven Montel from the

American Film Institute presented on “La industria cinematográfica internacional / The International Film Industry”; Sergio Molina and Guillermo Arriaga, from the National Film Commission and Z Films respectively, spoke on the topic “Guión, la base para un proyecto exitoso / Script, the Foundation of a Successful Project”; and Phil Nemy of Disney presented “Get a reel job: Cómo entrar a los ‘majors’ en los Estados Unidos / Get a Reel Job: How to Break into the US ‘Majors’” (García, “Muestran”). Though these talks covered a wide range of topics, their common theme was that they created space for dialog and development of aspiring filmmakers. Festival visibility was gaining traction on the national stage as well. National newspaper coverage followed the festival, including the Mural in Guadalajara and Reforma in Mexico City. Journalist Juan Manuel García reported that TV coverage of the opening night was planned by Mexican national television channels, as well as Canal 22, MTV United States, Los Angeles’ PBS, and Texas’ Ritmo Latino (“Muestran”).

The years 2001 to 2003 represent a transitional period for the festival, during which it aimed to bolster a reputation of mentoring and supporting Mexican filmmakers, increase its international scope, and grow in its reach within the state of Guanajuato. Building off its previous organization of screenings, conferences, and panels, and buzz from the third year of the festival, in 2001, EEC began its custom of opening the festival in San Miguel for the first days of events, then moving to Guanajuato Capital for the second half of the festival. A few initiatives serve as illustrative examples of EEC’s expanding scope during this time, when EEC held its fourth through sixth editions, starting with the founding of a Women and Film and Television International (WIFTI) branch in Mexico in 2002.

The history of WIFTI Mexico (Mujeres en el Cine y la Televisión, abbreviated in Spanish as MCYTV) traces its origins to the 2001 EEC, when a group of women

including Hoch, actress Vanessa Bauche, and director Maryse Sistach, celebrated the announcement that a branch of this organization would be formally established in Mexico. During the festival, a tribute to Angélica Aragón was the highlight of the first meeting, and the event was covered by Televisa and TV Azteca (Rosas; Cabrera). The organization was officially established in 2002 as a non-profit, based in Mexico City, and incorporated as the Mexican chapter of WIFTI that same year (Mujeres Website). Since that year, during the festival, EEC/GIFF has hosted an event for MCYTV and honored outstanding women working in film and television. The women are often from the Mexican industries. For example in 2003, the honorees were the Cuban-born Carmen Montejo who built a reputable acting career during the Mexican Golden Age, and the Ariel-award winning editor Gloria Schoemann ("Festival cortometrajes"). Sometimes women from other countries have been highlighted, as in 2012, when Julie Taymor was one of the festival honorees, in recognition of her directorial work, including the biopic Frida (2002)—which won two Oscars and for which Salma Hayek was nominated for Best Actress. The annual MCYTV tributes have complimented other festival retrospectives, featured guests, and of course official selection screenings.

The commitment to inspire young women by celebrating the accomplishments of previous generations has been accompanied by other festival activities geared towards fostering talent. These include a screenwriting competition for Mexican scripts launched in 2002, a scholarship partnership with Vancouver Film School (VFS) starting in 2002, and the first Rally Malayerba in 2003. In brief, since 2002, EEC/GIFF has held a call for entries for short and feature film scripts, and awarded cash prizes to winners, in coordination with other sponsors including the Sociedad General de Escritores de México (the Mexican Writers Guild, or SOGEM), and one of the major creative unions, the Sindicato de Trabajadores de la Producción Cinematográfica (Workers Union for

Mexican Film Production, or STPC). Also since 2002, when Canada was featured as the festival's invited country, VFS has in most years offered full-year scholarships to a Mexican filmmaker or two, for the winner or winners in competition categories as arranged with EEC or GIFF. For example in 2003, in the script competition, Tomás Urtusuástegui's short "Carretera del norte" and Armando Vega's short "Los demonios de la tabla del 3" each were awarded $10,000 MXP, and Marco Arzulia's feature screenplay Julia won the top prize of $40,000 MXP. The winner that year of the VFS award was Manuel Blejerman, for his work as writer and director of the short film "Luciano" (Huerta). Finally, in 2003, EEC inaugurated a 24-hour filmmaking "rally" during which chosen teams, all from Mexico, shot and edited a short during the festival, which were all then screened for an audience. That initiative called Rally Malayerba lasted a few years, and after a break, eventually returned in another form in 2009, as the Rally Universitario (López Portillo).

All of the above-named projects kept some focus on national filmmakers as the festival increased in international scope. The tension between fostering national filmmakers and growing as an international festival was becoming more palpable on the national level, even as international reach and visibility was on the rise. This balance may be illustrated by comments that appear in the Mexican press in 2003, which celebrated EEC as the premiere festival in Latin America for short and avant-garde film and video, and highlighted the prizes to Mexican filmmakers, but were critical when it came to the competition; only five of the twelve winners were Mexican, and all of the major prizes went to foreign countries, including France, the United States, the Netherlands, and Australia (e.g. Huerta; "Festival en corto").

Internationally, buzz was spreading through invited guests. An example of positive review is reflected in an article by Anastacia Feldman from Radium, who wrote

that she and her colleague Jonathan Keeton traveled to Guanajuato "to speak about visual effects at the festival, which featured a series of workshops, discussions, alternative screenings and festivities." When describing her visit, she noted the reported 49,034 in attendance, and pointed out that the festival's "target audience was young people (20- to 35-year-olds) beginning a career in film or media" and that it "was packed with experienced directors, producers, government officials, legendary Mexican film artists, students, sponsors such as Kodak, and national and international media." Feldman observed, "It struck us how eager the students were about learning and specializing in the field of film," but above all she was impressed that the opportunity was there for young filmmakers, and that it was supported financially and culturally by the Mexican government and film community. During the subsequent years of the festival, the trend of expanding initiatives designed to support filmmakers' work from script to screen would continue.

From EEC's IPM to GIFF's "Supporting the Creation of a Solid Film Industry"

The second historical period for the festival begins with 2004. The inclusion of the IPM in EEC's seventh year marked a significant turn in the festival's development, towards the creation of new initiatives aimed at linking Mexican filmmakers to resources for national and international coproductions. Previous initiatives—like screenings and workshops with guests in attendance—had provided potential opportunities for networking and mentoring between attendees. While keeping the traditional workshops and guest presentations in the festival program, the IPM was created to provide a space explicitly dedicated to scheduled meetings between Mexican filmmakers and Mexican and foreign investors and distributors. It can be helpful to think of the recent years of festival growth in a couple stages. First, from 2004 to 2009, which are the initial years of

the IPM and the expansion of EEC to include other parallel film industry mentoring and networking opportunities. Second, from 2010 and beyond, as in the year 2010, EEC explicitly began running a number of the "behind the screens" activities under the umbrella of an "Industria / Industry" area of the festival. As EEC converted to its new name and identity of GIFF (Guanajuato International Film Festival) in 2011, a key component of the rebranding was promotion of its Industry divisions—for example, the IPM, the Bilateral Forum, and Incubadora / Incubator, all of which are discussed in upcoming sections. The 2012 Industry bilingual publications were emblazoned with the mantra of "Creatividad para encontrar nuevos mecanismos que fortalezcan el quehacer cinematográfico" or "Supporting the Creation of a Solid Film Industry" and, although activities were dropped or added through the years, this attitude underscored Hoch and her team's approach to every division well before 2012. After a discussion of the festival's trajectory from the seventh edition on, this chapter will return to focus in more detail on the IPM and the case study film projects.

Overall, EEC as a festival was growing in its reputation and its international scope. By 2004, the call for entries resulted in 620 submissions received from 31 countries (EEC, Séptimo 8). Festival catalog opening statements typically reflected continued commitment to fostering new ideas and filmmakers who break with tradition. For example, in the eighth edition in 2005, the theme of the festival was "Censura. Autocensura. Provocación. / Censorship. Self-Censorship. Provocation." That year, Sarah Hoch wrote, "It is an enormous honor to be a part of this event that has made us grow, mature, and which obligates us to reinvent ourselves in order to survive and be on the cutting edge, to join our efforts to the fight on behalf of Mexican cinema." She later added, "we now feel committed to seek out new opportunities, so that those with the will

to create do not face a wall that sometimes appears impenetrable" (EEC, Octavo 8).[39] That year's program included screenings of Mexican films that had faced censorship by the government, including Arturo Ripstein's La viuda negra (The Black Widow, 1977) and Jorge Fon's Rojo amanecer (Red Dawn, 1989).

This attitude of support for renegade films underscored all aspects of the activities the festival undertook as it built its reputation, and has informed both competitive and non-competitive categories throughout the years. As noted previously, EEC's official selection categories included the very types of films that at other festivals are generally off the radar or, at the least, hidden behind the more popular feature narrative categories. Major film festivals, including the industry leaders Sundance Film Festival, Cannes Film Festival, Berlin International Film Festival, and Toronto International Film Festival, are almost always anchored in feature film categories lavished with press and red carpet attention, with short films and documentaries as sidebars. Some festivals specialize in these latter categories, for example the American Film Institute DOCS Film Festival or the Palm Springs International Festival of Short Films, but they are in the minority. In 2005, EEC's international official selections covered Short Fiction, Documentary Features and Shorts, Experimental Shorts, Animated Shorts, and Video Shorts. In addition to the international official selection categories, EEC also had major sections devoted to national cinema, including presenting the Mexican Censorship Showcase, films in Official Selection Mexico, Official Selection Guanajuato, a series of Mexican Feature films starring the year's national honorees (Diana Bracho, Julio Alemán, Ofelia Medina, Ana Ofelia Murguia, and Pedro Vargas), short film selections from the CUEC, and a few films from the Cooperativa Morelos (the Morelos Cooperative).

[39] Translated from original Spanish.

National tributes over the years were complemented by international guests in attendance for master classes, premieres and retrospectives. Major international guests, auteurs noted for their contributions to world cinema, have included Irvin Kerschner in 2004; Oliver Stone in 2005; Gaspar Noé in 2006; Tim Burton and Kenneth Anger in 2007; Spike Lee and Deepa Mehta in 2008; and Peter Greenaway in 2009, to name just a few. A look at 2008's catalog illustrates the ways in which national and international guests are featured in the festival. That year, San Miguel's festival dates were held July 18 through 22, and Guanajuato Capital's on July 23 to 27. A national tribute for actor and dancer Yolanda Montes, known as "Tongolele," in San Miguel de Allende included a parade followed by special presentation during Friday-night opening ceremonies, a master class held the next day, and a Sunday screening of Han matado a Tongolele (1948, Dir. Roberto Galvadón). Although not Mexican herself, Tongolele gained fame as an exotic dancer in Mexico City before performing in a number of Mexican Golden Age films, including the one screened during EEC. In Guanajuato Capital, a tribute to long-time screen and telenovela actor Joaquín Cordero included a master class on Saturday, a tribute ceremony Saturday evening, and a screening of Las dos huerfanitas (1950, Dir. Roberto Rodríguez) that evening.

Also that year, EEC highlighted two international guests, each with a reputation for being a groundbreaking filmmaker, unafraid to shy away from controversial issues with their films. Invited guest Deepa Mehta was in attendance; Canadian-based, the filmmaker developed an international reputation for no-holds barred approach to filming and discussing India's past and present, including but not limited to colonization and diaspora. The festival screened her acclaimed films Water (2005) and Earth (1998) on Friday and Saturday in San Miguel, respectively. The festival held a tribute ceremony on Saturday, and Mehta offered a master class on Sunday. US filmmaker Spike Lee and his

work were celebrated even more extensively, and in the foreground was his identity as an independent voice committed to African American issues. In Guanajuato Capital on Thursday July 24th, the festival hosted Lee's master class and the formal tribute ceremony. Throughout the entire run of the festival in both cities, EEC screened a retrospective of Lee's films including Do the Right Thing (1989), Summer of Sam (1997), all four parts of When the Levees Break (2006), and four other films (EEC, Festival 2008 275-77, 320-35). Guests such as these helped to sustain the discourse around the festival as one committed to bringing to Mexico some of the top international filmmakers of the day, situating them as leaders both in their craft as storytellers and in their engagement with social issues. National newspapers, including Reforma out of Mexico City, Mural out of Guadalajara, Jalisco, El Norte of Monterrey, Nuevo León, and Palabra from Saltillo, Coahila, focused a good deal of press attention on these guests, on other celebrity attendees, and on another group of filmmakers who formed part of a new EEC initiative named "MexiCannes."

MexiCannes was launched as a joint venture between EEC/GIFF and the Cannes Cinéfondation La Résidence du Festival, and first ran during EEC in 2008. As a representation of the two organizations' coming together, the name "MexiCannes" blends "Mexican" with "Cannes"—a playful conflation of terms indicative of the transnational nature of the program. For its part, the Cannes Cinéfondation residency program was founded in 2000. Filmmakers are selected for a multi-month Résidence du Festival in Cannes based on the merits of their previous short films and/or first feature film. This means that each participant in the Cannes Résidence program has gained recognition on the international festival circuit, and is working on their first or second feature films. During their time in France, the Résidence provides training and connects them to mentors who assist in the development of their projects, including initial promotional

materials. Starting with 2008, EEC/GIFF began inviting the Cannes Résidence's previous year's twelve laureates to Guanajuato for the duration of the July festival, naming the new initiative "MexiCannes." The festival also selected two Mexican filmmakers, at the same stage in their careers as the Cannes laureates (specifically, working on their first or second feature), to round out the MexiCannes group. Together, the group in attendance participated in the festival's "front of house" with film screenings and press conferences, and in "behind the screens" activities including a series of Master Classes and private workshops with other invited guests of the festival. Additionally, the MexiCannes filmmakers were invited to present their work at the IPM, which marked for most of them the first time they had the opportunity to pitch their film projects.

The MexiCannes initiative is exemplary of EEC's evolving strategy to raise its profile along two complimentary lines. First, by partnering with other prestigious international institutions that have access to top international filmmakers on the art festival circuit (in this case, Cannes), the festival aligned itself with that institution's reputation and extended its own invitational reach for such guests. Second, by formally incorporating into MexiCannes activities a group of national and international filmmakers who were poised to produce their next films, the festival branched out with its mentoring and networking programs. While continuing to provide support for Mexican filmmakers and projects, EEC was expanding reach further into international and transnational settings, as will be discussed further in the upcoming sections that discuss the IPM and the development of EEC's Industry area.

Another way to illustrate how the festival was gaining prestige on the international circuit, in terms of attracting international guests and cutting-edge programming, is exemplified by the 2009 festival, during which Peter Greenaway was one of the tribute honorees. As with other previously featured guests, such as Oliver

Stone or Gaspar Noé, Greenaway as a filmmaker is someone who built a reputation on the international film circuit as an auteur, pushing limits in subject matter and treatment in his work. In 2003-2004, Greenaway had worked on an especially ambitious undertaking, The Tulse Luper Suitcases, a multi-episodic, mixed media, highly experimental work. In an interview published in Film Comment in 2009, Greenaway said that it:

> [W]as meant to be my summation, my magnum opus, where I tried to put in everything that I'd learned about the media, but also everything about my social and political history, too. But it was singularly unsuccessful in the cinema. It's far too advanced, far too intense, too complicated. (Jacobson 20)

Where Greenaway had success with the project was with screening the "film" as a live veejay-deejay multi-screen performance; Greenaway traveled with the project, installing it in different venues around the world in different arrangements—and different numbers—of screens depending on the venue. One of these venues was the outdoor space in the plaza of the historic "Alhondiga de Granaditas" in Guanajuato Capital, Mexico. The video portion ran on six side-by-side screens, accompanied by mixed audio, as the featured entertainment for the closing night party for the 2009 Expresión en Corto International Film Festival. While the EEC performance itself generated more buzz nationally than internationally, this move did situate EEC within an elite circle of hosts, which had included: the Moscow International Film Festival / Media Forum; the Palazzo Te in Mantova, Italy; and the Teatro Lope de Vega in Seville, Spain, to just mention a few ("Peter Greenaway—Live Cinema").

The final stage of the festival's growth to be discussed here begins in 2010, which corresponds to the year that "Industria" or "Industry" took shape formally as an identity within the festival as an umbrella term for a number of activities. In 2010, the Industry activities that took place were the seventh IPM (7IPM), the Bilateral Forum "Argentina +

Mexico," the third MexiCannes Summer Residence Program, and EEC also introduced a new initiative they called "Incubadora" or "Incubator." In response to feedback from attendees that many of the participants in the IPM had not been prepared to professionally pitch, EEC had worked to develop activities such as panels, pre-pitch workshops, and the like, to try to coach participants towards effective presentations of their projects. Professional film industry investors, both attached to studios or as independent producers, are used to certain elements being highlighted during a pitch session.[40] These elements include a cogent summary of the story, an idea of the formal elements or visual style of the project, a clear and workable budget, a discussion of what is already in place for the project, and identification of what is still lacking for its realization. The Incubator platform was launched in part to address the above-mentioned critique of IPM participants, as one of Incubator's founding principles was to advise filmmakers in the skills of packaging and pitching their projects. The first year's advisors represented film industry professionals with experience in the United States, Hong Kong and related Asian markets, Canada, Mexico, Brazil, and by extension much of Latin America (EEC, Festival 2010 292-96).

Most of the discussion in this chapter so far has focused on the festival's "front of house" program and guests, in order to provide background to the primary focus of upcoming sections: EEC's Industry area as anchored by the IPM. As noted above, Industria / Industry as a formal division of EEC became concrete in 2010 at the same time as the festival added Incubator; as such 2010 was a transformational year for the festival from a view "behind the screens." The 2010 transitions, though, were further realized by additional changes in festival organization and character in 2011 which were

[40] As noted previously in this chapter, a "pitch" session in this context refers to a meeting in which the representative or representatives of a selected film project have the opportunity to present their film to invited industry guests, for a pre-determined time per pitch.

more visible to a general audience who would not have access to "Industry" activities. In 2011, in anticipation of its fourteenth edition, the festival formally changed names from "Festival Internacional de Cine Expresión en Corto" to "Festival Internacional de Cine Guanajuato International Film Festival (GIFF)." GIFF introduced for the first time official red carpet protocols for major screenings in both cities. Red carpets showcased national and international filmmakers and films, including Gerardo Naranjo's Miss Bala (Mexico 2011), Rafa Lara's Labios rojos (Red Lips, Mexico 2011), Paul Schrader's Mishima: A Life in Four Chapters (USA 1985) and Park Jungbum's The Journals of Musan (South Korea 2010) (GIFF Festival 2011). While some events were standing room only and not everyone could get in, even these gala style events continued to be free and, space permitting, open to all attendees. Additionally, everyone could walk the red carpet; in fact in San Miguel if you wanted to get into a red carpet event, you had to walk across the platform as it was the only access point to the venue.

According to festival records, the call for entries in 2011 resulted in 2,738 film submissions representing 108 countries; more than 400 films were screened during the festival, and more than 90,000 people were in attendance (Festival GIFF "Quienes somos"). Also in 2011, the festival added a new competitive category. Without doing away with the Mexican First Feature selection, GIFF also included an International First Feature section. Both First Feature sections in 2011 included eight films in competition. The rest of the film program was rounded out by a diverse program that the festival had built its reputation upon, including short film sections, documentary categories, Mexican showcases and other specially curated sections like a series of Korean horror films screened in the cemeteries in San Miguel and Guanajuato Capital.

Two examples of post-2011 festival coverage illustrate some of the ways that GIFF's activities have attracted national and international attention in addition to those

noted previously. First, in May of 2011, Mexican newspapers reported on Sarah Hoch and GIFF's presence at the 64th Cannes Film Festival. Items highlighted included that GIFF presented a selection of Mexican Short Films in the official video library of the Cannes Short Film Corner, and the official public launch of the call for entries for the "Alza la voz contra la violencia doméstica" ("Speak Out Against Domestic Violence") short film competition. This marked the fifth "Alza la voz" partnership between GIFF and Avon México. For the fourth time, GIFF hosted a brunch for the year's Cannes Cinéfondation participants, and announced plans for the upcoming MexiCannes Summer Residency program in Guanajuato. A press release through Notimex pointed out that the Cannes Cinéfondation residents would have the opportunity to attend master classes and workshops at GIFF, and also meet with producers at the IPM, with the aim of helping them move their films forward. Notably, the article also pointed to how the "young filmmakers among the best in the world" would be able to "create ties with the residents and with Mexico, planting the possibility of returning to Mexico to film" ("Tendrá Festival de Cine").[41] These observations point to major ways that GIFF had situated itself on the national and international stage as a pivotal player, both in terms of Mexican filmmakers receiving attention internationally, as well as bringing attention to possibilities of international filmmakers being enticed to film in Mexico.

The second example of coverage is the highlight video "Guanajuato International Film Festival 2011" produced and directed by Chris Miller and hosted by Tony Denman, as an episode of "Short Notice" for the short movie TV channel, Shorts HD. Chris Miller attended GIFF in 2011 with a team to shoot interviews and footage of events thoughout the duration of the festival. The resulting episode's overviews briefly presented snapshots

[41] Translated from original Spanish.

of the host cities of San Miguel and Guanajuato Capital, with flash shots of red carpets and some of the stars, including Mario Almada (a fixture of Mexican cinema since the 1960s, and one of the honorees of the 2011 festival), and the internationally acclaimed actor Udo Kier (who was a jury member at GIFF 2011). It then focused primarily on profiling two events: Movies with Mummy and the 48-hour Rally Universitario. The focus during Movies with Mummy was on how audience members got to view Korean horror films from their seats within the Guanajuato cemetery, in the middle of the night. The narration of the episode built up how unique and important the festival was for bringing cool films to Mexico. In one scene, an unnamed interviewee says on camera, "I love the film festival because it really opens your eyes to all these types of films that are in the world." The "Short Notice" section on the Rally Universitario highlighted how involved the youth of the country were in making movies, and how excited they were to be a part of the competition at GIFF. Voice-over narration pointed out that each team had access to a Mexican star as one of their actors; the segment focused primarily on one of the teams, in particular the one that won the Audience Award for the short film the team produced during the Rally. These elements are an interesting compliment to the way that the article about GIFF at Cannes focused on Mexican reaching out internationally. The Short Notice episode focused quite a bit on ways that the host cities brought the international film world to Mexico, and by extension how Mexican filmmakers were being inspired creatively by participating in festival events.

Along with all of the film screenings and celebrity buzz at GIFF, Hoch as festival founder and her staff remained committed to cultivating new ideas and fostering up-and-coming filmmakers, through the Rally, the Screenwriting contests, Incubator, MexiCannes, panels, workshops, master classes and more. One of the main anchors of this has been the IPM.

MEXICO'S FIRST INTERNATIONAL PITCHING MARKET

As EEC was going into its seventh year, Mexican feature film production levels were still very low. IMCINE reported that the year 2003 had seen only 29 Mexican features produced, 17 with state support (see Chapter 1, Table 1). In Guadalajara, at the FICG, the first Mercado de Cine Iberoamericano en Guadalajara / Guadalajara Film Market ran in the spring of 2003, and the second Market in the spring of 2004. In the fall of 2003, the first FICM was held in Morelia. Understandably, each from its own vantage point, IMCINE and the festivals were all concerned with the state of Mexican film production; since each was invested in supporting and promoting Mexican films and filmmakers, their existence as cultural institutions was dependent upon the reinvigoration of national filmmaking. The festivals would each, in turn and beginning with EEC, respond with initiatives aimed at intervening in the crisis at the production level.

In 2004, the festival Expresión en Corto coordinated and hosted the first ever IPM in Mexico. At the time, in the call for entries, the coordinators elaborated the following reasons for creating the IPM:

- projects of quality exist in Mexico, but are unable to access funds in order to finance production;
- projects that are able to find funding for production, may not find national or international commitments for distribution, and therefore do not recoup their investments;
- filmmakers generally lack resources that would allow them to travel to visit with funders, or possible coproducers, or possible agents for presales;
- Mexican distribution companies are not in the habit of seeking out projects in their country and miss out on the opportunity to act on their behalf. (EEC, Séptimo insert between 176-77)

While the above list reiterates points made throughout this project, these particular ones are repeated here as they were the most salient to the coordinators of the event at the time of its initial design. Furthermore, they specifically point to fact that the IPM coordinators wanted to address particular infrastructural weaknesses within the Mexican industry, namely a lack of interconnectedness among the industry's key players. The above list identified that funding entities and filmmakers, creatives and coproducers, filmmakers and distributors, even when they existed, were not working together. The film industry needed a spotlight on not only the problem, but on solutions, and the IPM provided one way to start moving in a new direction: try to get quality Mexican film projects into the same room as people with resources to make them and distribute them.

As discussed in Chapter 3, a few models existed in the US and Europe for programs to support and mentor filmmakers, and connect them to resources. A few international festivals had established programs, with Sundance Institute Lab Program (founded in 1981, and actually predating the Sundance Film Festival) as a recognized leader. The other leader was the Hubert Bals Fund (HBF) founded in 1989. Others were just getting going in the early 2000s, including the Rotterdam Lab at the International Film Festival Rotterdam (IFFR) in 2001, "Cine en Construcción" (Films in Progress) a collaboration between the San Sebastián Film Festival in Spain and the Latin American Film Festival in Toulouse, France in 2002, and the Berlinale Talent Campus in 2003. Each program developed in response to its own founders' missions, for example, Sundance supporting US independent and foreign filmmakers, or the HBF prioritizing film projects from global South countries. The IPM fit into the trend of festivals reaching out to support filmmakers with works in development or works in progress.

It is important to note that at the outset, the IPM was not designed explicitly as a mentoring program. However, through the process of designing and implementing the

first few of the pitching markets, including even leading up to the first, it was clear to organizers that there were few people in Mexico who knew how to take a project and professionally package the elements for a pitch. In a 2013 interview, Hoch took the time to reflect on preparations in anticipation of the first IPM. She said that a model for the IPM "didn't exist in Mexico, and it didn't exist in all of Latin America. Obviously it's a culture that's born in the United States from producers giving you short amounts of time to convince them they should make your movie" (Hoch Interview 2013).

Hoch believed that a short, direct presentation or the project "pitch" was going to be difficult for Mexican filmmakers, and identified two reasons related to cultural and business history. First, culturally, meetings in Mexico open with the protocol of each party taking time to talk to get to know each other—or if they know each other already, to take time to get caught up personally—prior to any business being conducted. This can create confusion when one party expects to follow such protocol, and the other is not accustomed to this practice. In the context of a pitch, Hoch anticipated that Mexican producers would have trouble getting to the point quickly, which experienced investors would expect them to be able to do. Second, beyond needing to learn how to succinctly present a project in limited time, professionally, most Mexican filmmakers were not actually familiar with the business of producing films in "Hollywood" or in other international modes. The historically insular nature of Mexican filmmaking was detrimental to cultivating producers who could conduct business nationally, let alone internationally. According to Hoch:

> So we first had to teach people what pitches were and how they worked, because Mexico came from a culture of, to make a movie, the producers, and there were very few real producers, but the producers made a phone call to the Banco Cinematográfico Mexicano,[42] which was like IMCINE, and to their friends, and

[42] The Mexican Cinematographic Bank.

> their friends financed their films, and they owned the cinemas at that time too. So it was kind of like a "negocio redondo,"[43] and few guys were in it. (Hoch Interview 2013)

In summary, the idea of an IPM and "pitching" in general was a foreign concept in Mexico, few professional producers existed who knew how to put projects together, and film funding had historically been funneled through exclusive networks whether private or governmental.

In terms of funding models, the Banco Nacional Cinematográfico, though dissolved by the 1980s as discussed in Chapter 2, had been such a contentious organization during its existence, its operations dominated by top-down interests and internal politics, that its legacy was still overdetermining after its closure. Institutions that took its place continued to operate in similar manners. The closed system that had resulted in the decline of Mexican film production was a good deal of inspiration for the legislative actions identified in early Chapters, namely: (1) the revamping of the Ley Cinematográfico (Cinematographic Law) in 1998; (2) the establishment of the Fondo de Inversión y Estímulos al Cine (Fund for Film Investment and Stimulation, or FIDECINE); (3) the establishment of the Fondo para la Producción Cinematográfica de Calidad (Fund for the Production of Quality Films, or FOPROCINE); and (4) the creation of the Estímulo Fiscal a la Producción Cinematográfica Nacional (Financial Stimulus for National Cinematic Production, or EFICINE). The funding programs FIDECINE, FOPROCINE, and EFICINE have been administered by committee through IMCINE, with the first two gaining some traction in the early 2000s, and with EFICINE becoming an additional funding program in 2006. However, in order for filmmakers to apply for funds they had to first know funds were were there, and second be able to put together a

[43] "Negocio redondo" is a phrase meaning something that's a good deal for those involved. In this context, the arrangements were a good deal for the inner circle of businessmen who kept film financial deals within that tight group.

professional project application. Because of the lack of professional producers working in the Mexican film industry, few were prepared to put together such applications. This was concerning not only in the context of these funds, but also in the context of creating initiatives such as the IPM which was designed to push Mexican filmmakers and their projects forward in general (Villa Smythe Interview; Hoch Interview; Ugalde Interview).

For the first three editions of the IPM, 2004-2006, a representative from the Mexican Writers Guild (SOGEM) was intimately involved with the logistics of launching the Call for Entries, coordinating project reception, and organizing the schedule of events during the festival dates in Guanajuato. In 2007, for the fourth IPM, EEC contracted Andrea Stavenhagen for these responsibilities; Stavenhagen had been working with Guadalajara and Morelia since 2005, having co-launched and directed Morelia Lab with Carlos Taibo from its inception. From the fifth edition in 2008 through at least 2012, the logistics of the call, reception of projects, and event coordination have been handled in-house at EEC/GIFF. A committee under the direction of Hoch has curated the selection of projects each year.[44]

In order to prepare for the first IPM, EEC collaborated principally with SOGEM, but also with Mexico's Fund for Film Investment and Stimulation (Fondo de Inversión y Estímulos al Cine, or FIDECINE), the Motion Picture Association Audiovisual Entertainment for Global Audiences (MPA), the Bilateral Commission Mexico-USA for film industry development, and Mexico's Congressional Commission for Radio, Television, and Cinematography. José Antonio Elo Lagarde served as SOGEM's point person for partnering with Hoch; together they developed the style and logistics of the

[44] Personal disclosure, for the years of 3IPM in 2006 and 4IPM in 2007, from which the particular film case studies for this chapter originate, though I worked with the coordinating team at EEC, I was not responsible for the selection of projects in any way, nor was I responsible for selecting the potential investors who were invited to listen to those projects. I did communicate with invited investors to confirm and coordinate their attendance, and I was responsible for co-coordinating event logistics during both years.

first few years of the IPM. Elo Lagarde did not come from filmmaking training or experience, but rather a business administration background. Originally he got involved with SOGEM as a creative outlet, learning to write screenplays because it interested him. After coordinating a seminar for producers at SOGEM, which he was asked to do because of his business experience, Elo Lagarde realized that "the producer's role was very similar to what I'd been doing previously, which was business. The producer is the businessman of filmmaking. He's responsible for the entire picture. [...] He's the father of the film" (Elo Lagarde Interview).[45] He also discovered quickly that there were very few working producers who actually stayed with a project after completion, and who cared about the long-term profitability of the films they worked on; Elo Lagarde felt the need to change that, to empower and train filmmakers to be successful business-minded producers. Elo Lagarde took this perspective with him as he prepared for the IPM, and it informed his mindset behind the organization of the initial years of the event (Elo Lagarde Interview).

The first four years of the IPM, from 2004-2007, generally had the same organizational structure, and featured projects originating from Mexican filmmakers. The one exception for project origin was in 2007, with the inclusion of the US-based project The Shore Thing, which had potential to be a US-Mexico coproduction (the US was the invited country of honor for the festival that year). Organization-wise, each project was assigned an individual private space, which the project representatives occupied for two or three days of pitching sessions. During those days of the first IPM through the fourth IPM, the participants who listened to pitches moved from space to space according to a pre-assigned schedule. The sessions were one on one, with project principals and

[45] Translated from original Spanish.

company representatives speaking with each other at each appointment.[46] The dynamic was set up for each selected project to meet with each attending company, regardless of whether or not they seemed to be a good potential fit to work together. As upcoming discussion including regarding the two case study films in this chapter will illustrate, projects were selected with diversity in mind, some with more commercial potential than others; additionally, invitations to participants aimed to attract a diverse group of national and international producers, distributors, and fund representatives, again some with more independent or art cinema credentials, and some with more popular interests. For example, for the third IPM in 2006, filmmakers met with representatives from Patagonik in Argentina, a largely commercially oriented group; Maya Pictures, then a US independent specializing in Latino content; Séptimo Sello, an independent company looking for a project to coproduce; and Warner Bros. Cine, which had a production branch in Mexico at the time, to just name a few (EEC, "Contactos Finales Pitching 2006"). This style of meeting schedule was based on Hoch's firm belief that the Mexican filmmakers at the IPM needed to extend their networks in order to advance long-term careers. The particular project they were pitching got them the opportunity, but they needed to take advantage of the contact not only for the moment but for the future (Hoch Intervews). Careers are built and sustained in the film industry by networks, and the design of the IPM was predicated on this.

During the initial four years of the IPM, the pitching session days opened with, or were book-ended by, conferences or forums featuring topics related to the state of the film industry nationally and internationally, often with emphasis on the invited country of honor. For example, in 2007, the opening conference was about the funding program

[46] This information and other organizational comments about internal workings of the IPM primarily derive from my personal involvement with the event 2004-2011, and are complimented by other sources where referenced.

EFICINE 226 or "Ley 226," which at the time was only in its second year. Featured panelists included producer Monica Lozano, then General Director of Altavista, and the panel was moderated by Víctor Ugalde, a major architect of Ley 226. The closing conference was a Coproduction and Financing Conference, moderated by Richard Ham of DeCine, and panelists included Jason Gurvitz, then Director of Production for Maya Releasing, and others who spoke about their experience in this area, and their estimations of future possible collaborations between Mexico and the US (EEC, Décimo 378-79).

Since 2008, the dynamic of the IPM has changed substantially. Above all, while continuing to feature projects originating in Mexico, the IPM explicitly began incorporating international participants in two major areas. First, the selected films include a number of "Cross Over" projects, specifically projects that could be co-produced between Mexico and the yearly invited country of honor. The invited countries and cross-over emphases have included India in 2008, the United Kingdom in 2009, Argentina in 2010, South Korea in 2011, and others since then. Second, the IPM has prominently showcased the MexiCannes participants and their projects. The majority of the MexiCannes filmmakers are not from Mexico, but their projects have yearly comprised a significant segment of the IPM selection. An additional way the IPM's dynamic changed actually stemmed from this change in project selection, because the overall number of projects participating grew with the inclusion of the MexiCannes pitches. Instead of project representatives pitching over two or three days as had occurred in 2004 through 2007, since the fifth IPM in 2008 through at least 2012, each project has been assigned one of the two pitching days only. Historically this has resulted in the MexiCannes group being assigned one of the presentation days all together; then the "Mexican" projects selected, as well as the "Cross Over" projects, have been slated into

the schedule in a way that roughly splits the total number of projects presented equally between the two days.

Also since 2008, in partnership with IMCINE, the panels traditionally offered in coordination with the IPM have been formalized into international Bilateral Forums. In these forums, participants from Mexico and the invited country of honor have exchanged information about the state of each country's infrastructures for financing/production, distribution, and exhibition. In theory, this can give attendees of those sessions, from either side of the table, an introduction to the other's cinematic culture and history, before meeting with them formally for business. The 2012 Bilateral Forum serves as a solid representative of the direction the IPM and related activities took since 2008. The Bilateral Forum has served as an opening event, taking place before the formal Pitching Market sessions, with panels featuring invited leaders in the industry from Mexico and the invited country of honor, which was The Netherlands in 2012. Panelists covered a variety of topics, related to historical overviews and current states of production, coproduction, distribution, and exhibition in the featured countries, as well as possibilities of future partnerships. A sample of the guest speakers includes Ger Bouma, Head of Co-production and Distribution at the Netherland Film Fund; Gamila Ylstra, Director and CEO of Binger Filmlab; Wilant Boekelman, Managing Director of Waterland Films; Martha Orozco, Producer with Cinefábrica/Martfilms; Hugo Villa, Director of Production at IMCINE; Nelleke Driessen, Managing Director of Fortissimo Films; and Alejandro Lebrija, Managing Director of Gussi Artecinema (GIFF, Industria/Industry 2012: 14-15).

While the IPM has expanded substantially in its scope and mission since the first years, it remains a major event of the festival and a highlight of "Industry" activities, promoting the production and co-production of films in Mexico and with Mexican talent. The IPM has benefitted from the visibility and attractive power of the festival, EEC/GIFF

which invites guests from all over the country and the world, to screenings and red carpets and parties, to panels and forums and other parallel events, and—starting in 2004—to listen to the pitches and meet the filmmakers at the IPM. Based on my professional experience, and reinforced by interviews for this chapter and upcoming chapters, filmmakers selected to pitch their films often have high expectations for closing deals at the time of meetings, especially if it is their first time at such events. The celebratory nature of the festival's offerings, and buzz around who is attending the IPM, may serve to create these expectations. It is also true that deals, for example coproduction arrangements, can in rare cases result directly from the meetings, which is of course a hoped-for outcome from many stakeholders.

The purpose of referencing the production histories of La Ticla / Amar a morir (Love 'Till Death) and La brújula la lleva el muerto (The Compass Is Carried by the Dead Man) in this chapter is to provide a lens through which to consider first-hand experiences of filmmakers from Mexico, and to start to evaluate participation in the IPM in Guanajuato as part of production timelines. Since I narrowed my overall study for feasibility reasons to include two case study films per initiative (two each from the IPM at EEC, the Encuentro at FICG, and Morelia Lab at FICM), and the variables in every instance were significant in terms of project type and also industry attendees each year, I decided to find two projects that were distinct from each other on a few basic criteria. In terms of similarity I sought projects of Mexican origin that, after participating in an IPM, were completed; beyond that I looked for projects that based on available data at the outset appeared to follow different paths in terms of form and funding models. As elaborated upon in the upcoming sections, Amar a morir represented a more conventional film narratively and formally, it was funded in part by FIDECINE (indicating it was considered a commercially viable project) and EFICINE, was released theatrically in

Mexico and Colombia, and was available in a few VOD and DVD formats in the US and Mexico. For its part La brújula represented an art cinema film that was, at the time, circulating on the festival circuit; it was narratively challenging, and funded in part through EFICINE as a project of the Mexican-based independent production company Arte Mecánica.

When I chose the two films, I did not know whether the filmmakers would perceive their experience in the IPM as having been beneficial to the eventual completion or distribution of the works or not. This turned out in large part not to have been their perception. However, there was still a good deal to be learned from these case studies that could be applied to a more comprehensive study of films that have gone through the IPM. Overall, the filmmaker accounts from Amar a morir and La brújula both reinforced the nature of filmmaking as one deeply indebted to networking and pushing through challenges. After delving into the two film case studies, this chapter will wrap with conclusions, bringing together some analysis of the intersections between the festival, the IPM, and Mexican film production.

La Ticla / Amar a morir (Love 'Till Death): Participant in 3IPM (2006)

The project La Ticla, by writer/director/co-producer Fernando Lebrija, was one of seventeen projects selected to participate in the third annual IPM (3IPM) at EEC, in 2006 (refer to Appendix D for complete list of selected projects). The film marked Lebrija's move from shorts into features, and from television production for MTV and Televisa into feature film production. At the time of the 3IPM, the project's working title was La Ticla, named after a surfing beach in the state of Michoacán that served as inspiration for the story; it was completed and released under the title Amar a morir (Love 'Till Death). A commercially oriented drama set largely in the surfing milieu of the coasts of

Michoacán, México, the narrative follows a rebellious young man trying to escape from his father's expectations of him. As heir to his father's banking empire, Alejandro feels trapped, and seeks adventure and love outside those confines, but his father does not back down easily. Alejandro escapes to the beach where he falls in love with Martina, but she is married to the local drug lord. Tensions rise as both Alejandro's father and Martina's husband try to keep the two lovers apart to no avail; their attempt to escape ends in a tragic hail of bullets. By "commercially oriented," I mean that the plot is linear, with clear cause-and-effect relationships linking events, and it features a defined conflict with rising tension and then resolution. Additionally, Lebrija stated that from the beginning, his goal for the film was to reach commercial markets through theatrical release and subsequent DVD and television sales (Lebrija Interview Jan. 2013).

In the early 2000s, after working for about ten years in Guadalajara and then Mexico City on productions of "all type of shows for all type of channels," Lebrija made the move to Los Angeles to attend the American Film Institute (AFI) and try to transition out of television and into film (Lebrija Interview Jan. 2013). Even with all of his years of producing, and even though he wanted to direct films, his study track for his MFA at AFI was in production, because he considered the schools in the US to be superior to Mexican schools in that track, and he knew he needed that skill set. In an interview with this author in 2013, Lebrija expressed his frustration with Mexico's producer situation at the time, which echoes trends previously noted in this project:

> I think that Mexican producers, they're business guys, they think they can get money, and they become producers, just like that. But they don't know anything about scripts, they don't know anything about how to support a director in their decisions, you know, creatively or however. Plus, you know how Mexico is mostly like a directors' world, where they partner with producers to make the directors' movies, so at some point you finish shooting the movie, and the

> producers just run away from you, and leave you with the whole package so you can finish it. (Lebrija Interview Jan. 2013)

Lebrija knew that he still could learn a lot, about all aspects of producing a film from the idea stage through whatever happens with the completed film. After AFI, Lebrija enrolled in a one-year diploma program at UCLA for screenwriting. The professor of the course, Harrison Reiner, had previously been Lebrija's mentor in the National Association of Latino Independent Producers' Latino Writers Lab, with a different project. While Lebrija was at UCLA, he was working on the script that would eventually become Amar a morir; Reiner joined the project as co-writer and the two worked on developing the screenplay (Lebrija Interviews).

Leading up to applying to the 3IPM, Lebrija started looking for financing, and he met producer Matthias Ehrenberg at FICM who was interested in the project. Lebrija was committed to staying on as director, but needed collaborators. He stated:

> The director has to decide about creativity, mostly, not about distribution and other things like that, unless you have experience, which is my case, but even so, I normally need producing partners because I cannot do a movie by myself. I just can't. It's so complicated. And a movie is about collaboration. If you have the best collaboration, the best movie you're going to get. (Lebrija Interview Jan. 2013)

Lebrija decided to work with Ehrenberg as co-producers on the project and, in 2006, they applied to the IPM at ECC. When interviewed about the reasoning behind attending the IPM, Lebrija stated that their primary goal was to secure funding for production, and he was open to see what possibilities could arise; one of the options he thought might be possible was securing pre-sales financing from a US company interested in buying rights to the film (Lebrija Interview Jan. 2013).

The companies registered to listen to pitches included some US companies, and also a number of others from a variety of international and Mexican-based entities. These

companies represented diverse interests, from Hollywood major division branches in Mexico, to independent production companies both within Mexico and the US, to international companies with the potential to invest in the projects in the IPM. For example, the Hollywood major divisions that had branches in Mexico at the time sent representatives—Columbia, Paramount, Twentieth Century Fox, and Warner Bros. Cine as well as Warner Bros. Home Video. Mexican companies included the iconic Estudios Churubusco Azteca, as well as the newly formed Lemon Films, both of which with potential to pick up projects—Estudios Churubusco Azteca because of its history, and Lemon Films as they were hot off of the success of Matando Cabos (Killing Cabos, 2004, Dir. Alejandro Lozano) which was a top box office earner in Mexico among nationally produced films at the time.

In addition to these noted companies, smaller Mexican companies also attended the IPM, as well as some US-based independent companies, and a few international companies with track records of production Latino or Latin American content. For example, Los Angeles-based Esparza/Katz Productions and Maya Pictures sent representatives; the two companies were formed by Moctesuma Esparza and Robert Katz to develop and produce Latino content, probably best known for Selena (1997, Dir. Gregory Nava). Additionally the Madrid-based company Morena Films was present, and was at the time building a reputation for successfully partnering on internationally coproduced films, for example Comandante (2003, Dir. Oliver Stone). Patagonik, a major player in Argentine films with hits such as Nueve reinas (Nine Queens, 2000, Dir. Fabián Bielinsky) and El último tren (The Last Train, 2002, Dir. Diego Arsuaga) also sent a representative. A representative of Fonds Sud Cinéma from France also attended pitching sessions, which points back to an overall goal of the market as envisioned by Hoch, that everyone with a project at the IPM should meet a variety of types of possible investors or

industry players. Until it was absorbed into another cultural grant organization in 2011, Fonds Sud awarded funds to filmmakers in Africa, Latin America, and Asia working on films with the potential for theatrical release. As part of the professionalization and networking process embedded in the design of the IPM, even if a director or producer did not envision applying to a European fund along the lines of Fonds Sud for the project they were developing at the time, perhaps in the future they would consider it—this way they would already have a sense of how it might work as well as a possible contact (EEC, "Contactos Finales Pitching 2006").

With all of these types of represented companies, and almost twenty meetings during the 3IPM, it is understandable that Lebrija held high hopes for immediate results. During the pitching market days, Lebrija, Ehrenberg, and another associate, attended the event and met with potential investors. No direct deal resulted from their meetings, and one of Lebrija's disappointments was that he perceived that not everyone who was listening to pitches was really there to look for projects, but instead were there for other reasons. When asked to elaborate, he opined,

> You know, it was a good experience, actually, for us. But I think one of the things I notice is that some of the guys there were just going because they [were invited] to go, you know. They knew they weren't going to do anything about anything, they just went there feeling rock stars and just taking the pitch. I think the way that the people that were chosen to go, I will say at least 50% were not into it, or they knew there was nothing they will do about it. And that was a little waste of time for them and for us, because we got really prepared to do this, you know, before hand. (Lebrija Interview Jan. 2013).

Lebrija's perspective provides an astute counterpoint to Hoch and the IPM committee's design: when everyone meets with everyone, and pitch listeners are pulled from invited guests, there are bound to be mismatches where participants may feel their time could be better spent elsewhere. Although participation in the IPM did not result in any transaction

that could move the project forward, Lebrija considered it a positive experience because it helped his team refine a package and presentation of the project, and "warm up with the pitching to people." The team had to prepare ahead of time, first to submit their materials to the selection committee, and subsequently in anticipation of meetings at the 3IPM. Then the IPM provided a space in which to practice delivering the pitch that they would have to continue to present, for another couple years, to see the project through (Lebrija Interview Jan. 2013).

Funding came together eventually, with substantial support from the Michoacán government for locations and other resources, the Mexican tax incentive EFICINE 226 and Mexican business investors for funding; these were complimented by Colombian tax incentives, and funding from Caracol Television in Colombia. Ehrenberg had substantial connections and experience in Colombia, and Lebrija's pick for the lead actress, Martina García was Colombian, so together that brought the Colombian co-production aspect to the project. Interestingly, when they applied for FIDECINE funds for production, they were turned down, but were recommended for the EFICINE 226 program. Additionally, Televisa / Videocine originally turned down backing the film. Lebrija and team managed to shoot the film with initial funding, which included support from Gussi Artecinema. The head of Gussi is Alejandro Lebrija, Fernando's uncle, and in 2013 Interviews, Fernando expressed gratitude that the company selected his project as one of four that they would support in production and distribution. Additionally, Fernando noted that Alejandro was not directly involved with the initial selection for production support, but once Gussi backed the film, Alejandro helped substantially with subsequent deals towards recouping investment and with the aim of turning a profit (Lebrija Interviews).

In fact, this support turned out to be key, because as the filmmakers reached post-production on Amar a morir, they ran out of money. Fortunately, at that point both

FIDECINE and Televisa were interested in backing the project based on rough cut and teaser. But Televisa's interest was contingent on distribution rights, and Alejandro Lebrija was instrumental in negotiating a rare co-distribution deal between Gussi and Televisa. In the end Fernando estimated the film's budget came in at $2.7 or $2.8 million dollars. It had not been Fernando's plan to submit the film to festivals, however his co-writer and co-producer Reiner was connected to that circuit (Lebrija Interviews). In 2009, Amar a morir opened on the festival circuit generating substantial public and critical buzz, with its world premiere at Santa Barbara Film Festival where it won best Spanish Language Film, and went on to other festivals including FICG where it won Best Feature ("Harrison Reiner"; "'Amar a morir' es el Mejor Largometraje").

The film also mostly took the path that Fernando had planned in commercial outlets, although that was not without a hitch either. Amar a morir enjoyed a decent theatrical run in Mexico with Box Office Mojo reporting total gross at just over $2.6 million USD as of May 2009 ("Amar a morir: Foreign Total"). In a recent interview, Fernando confirmed that in April of 2009 the film had generated close to $40 million MXP during a couple weeks in the theaters, but then the cinemas were closed because of a swine flu outbreak, and Amar a morir's run was cut short. After that, he and distributors decided not to release the film theatrically in the US, because the cost of prints and advertising was substantial, and they wanted to mitigate the risk of losing money overall on theatrical (Lebrija Interview Aug. 2013). At the time of this writing, the film has enjoyed release in a number of outlets; for example, it was released theatrically in Colombia, on Pay Per View and TV on Demand in the US, on Netflix and iTunes and DVD in Mexico, and there are plans for Univision and Telemundo to carry the film in the future. International sales agent FilmSharks holds worldwide rights, and continues to sell the film in new territories, including recently to China for TV and Pay Per View.

La brújula la lleva el muerto (The Compass Is Carried by the Dead Man): Participant in 4IPM (2007)

One year after La Ticla / Amar a morir participated in the market, the project La brújula la lleva el muerto (The Compass Is Carried by the Dead Man) formed part of a contingent of ten films featured by the fourth IPM (4IPM). The number of films selected corresponded to the fact that in the year 2007, EEC celebrated its tenth anniversary (refer to Appendix E for complete list of selected projects). This film also marked writer-director Arturo Pons' first foray into feature films, after directing a few short films. A dark comedy with social satire, La brújula follows the journey of a Chencho, a young adolescent, at first walking alone on the road. His mother has died, and he is traveling north to cross the US border, in order to unite with his brother. Along the way he meets an old man with a cart and a compass; Chencho hops on board. The man dies, but since he has the compass clenched in his hand, Chencho has no choice but to continue on the journey with the dead man by his side. They pick up a number of odd travelers along the way, and random events break up the monotony. The group's constituents never are clear where they are going, and the film ends with them continuing their journey, not having crossed into the US nor reaching any other final destination. In contrast to Amar a morir, La brújula does not follow a typical "classical" narrative; the passage of time from beginning to end is not clear, there is no defined conflict, no overarching tension, and no clear resolution. Instead, La brújula is indebted to other forms of narration, including art cinema and theater of the absurd.

The script grew out of work that Pons started when he was in school in Barcelona, Spain, at the Instituto de Cataluña. As homework, the students were required to write short scripts to bring to class, a new script for every class meeting. To meet this requirement, he started writing essentially a scene a day, based on experiences he had

heard about some immigrants from León, Guanajuato, where Pons is from. Twelve of these related scenes informed the first part of the first draft of the script. In an interview with this author, Pons noted that over time the story changed substantially, but he traced the origins of La brújula back to the class' requirements. Although he had the opportunity to film the project in Spain as part of the school's program, he turned that down in order to pursue producing it in Mexico. Pons knew he faced substantial challenges; he had not studied film in Mexico, he was not from Mexico City, and he really did not know anyone in the film industry nor did they know him. He began to seek a producer through contacts in León, and also set up meetings where he could (Pons Interview).

Pons and the eventual producer of the film, Ozcar Ramírez González of Arte Mecánica, stated in interviews that they found each other through mutual friends. They clicked quickly over the project despite not really knowing each other. Arte Mecánica was a fairly young company at the time, but Pons was comfortable with Ramírez; Ramírez responded positively to Pons' script even though he did not really understand it at first. At their initial meeting, Ramírez took time to listen to Pons describe the story and what the director envisioned for the production, and they decided to move forward together (Ramírez Interview; Pons Interview). According to Pons, when the two men met in 2006, the script was in its sixth draft, and the shooting script was the eighth. This reinforces his assertion that he had a clear idea of the film he wanted to make by that time, and was ready to bring people on board to help produce it. Pons had experience pitching short films in Spain, and was familiar with Expresión en Corto since he was from Guanajuato; he decided along with Ramírez to apply to the IPM. The goal was to try to find financing partners through the meetings (Pons Intervew).

That year's list of registered representative companies for the 4IPM was similar to the previous year's, except it was less international in that all companies were US or

Mexico-based. The festival's focus in 2007, as noted previously, was on celebrating the US as invited country of honor, and correspondingly, the IPM's activites highlighted projects that could possibly work as US-Mexico coproductions. Companies again included some of the Hollywood majors' branches in Mexico: Parmount; Warner Bros. Cine; Warner Bros. Home Video; and Twentieth Century Fox. Estudios Churubusco Azteca also sent a representative. Other Mexican-based companies were smaller in nature, including the camera rental and post-production house Aatomo Rentas & The Lab VFX (which would later become Chemistry Cine), and some fledging independent companies. The US was represented by a few independents, including again Maya Pictures. Others included FiGa Films, Granite Films, and Hunting Lane Films, all of whom had applied to attend; FiGa was seeking acquisitions for distribution, for their catalog of Latin American arthouse films, and Granite and Hunting Lane expressed interest in seeking films to co-produce with Mexico (EEC, "Informe final 4IPM").

Similar to Lebrija's experience with La Ticla/Amar a morir, Pons and Ramírez met a lot of people at the 4IPM but none who were interested in La brújula. No direct deal came through, to move the project forward, that they could trace to their participation in the IPM. The fact that no one was interested was a disappointment in the short term, but they both indicated that in their estimation this had at least something to do with the fact that they no capital of their own to back the project and were starting essentially from scratch with the script (Ramírez Interview; Pons Interview). Despite this, in interviews in 2013, Pons and Ramírez both pointed to ways in which the experience was helpful to their formation as professionals in the industry as well as to the project's eventual realization. We can start with their observation that the process helped to solidify a mutual vision of the project especially in terms of Ramírez understanding more completely Pons' concept. Because of working transnationally, they had worked so little

on the project in person that the opportunity to spend a couple of intense days together, in a format where they had to present the material over and over to a variety of potential investors. Pons also noted that he learned a lot from the experience of pitching a feature film, which he had not done before, and which was completely different from his previous pitches for short films (Ramírez Interview; Pons Interview).

The other major takeaway that Pons and Ramírez identified was that the opportunity to meet with so many company representatives gave them insight into what types of producing partners were not going to be helpful in realizing their film. Interestingly, they each mentioned a different set of producers. Pons pointed to conversations with "many of those who attended the pitches from the majors, for example Universal, or Fox Searchlight, and all of them were saying to us that they were looking for commercial cinema" (Pons Interview).[47] Clearly, La brújula with its meandering plot and meandering characters did not fit producers' ideas of a commercial film. However, for his part, Ramírez reflected that in his opinion the film also did not fit a typical art house for festival circuit style of film. It was not only producers who ultimately were not interested, as Ramírez observed:

> In addition to the commercial distributors, there were distributors who were looking for very specific things, and our film was pretty unusual; it was not one of those dark, art house films, where at about 45 minutes in someone dies and you are shocked, which is a typical structure for festival films. (Ramírez Interview)[48]

Interestingly, along the lines of Fernando Lebrija, Ramírez also critiqued the IPM coordinators' invitees to listen to the pitches. He stated that he thought many of them were not the right people to hear La brújula as a pitch, "For example, in one case one of the producers was from the US and was in Guanajuato to scout locations, and she was

[47] Translated from original Spanish.
[48] Translated from original Spanish.

invited to listen to pitches, even though in reality she was not looking to pick up an projects for coproduction" (Ramírez Interview).[49] Certainly a viable concern for all involved, that people who take their time to attend such initiatives have more meetings with the potential to be productive than less; these types of observations could be explored further with future research to see how other attendees interpreted the pros and cons of their participation.

The experience at the 4IPM pointed the team to seeking other types of investors, in particular Ramírez took away the conviction that he was not likely going to be able to sell the project, but rather that he was going to have to look for an investor who would be willing to take a chance on the people involved (namely himself and/or Pons) as opposed to the project itself (Ramírez Interview). After the IPM, Pons and Ramírez continued working on development and securing financing. It was challenging on a number of levels, including the fact that Pons was living in Spain, and the two worked together long distance and then in person when Pons visited Mexico. During this extended development period, Ramírez and Pons refined the script, and Ramírez met Jean Luc Rich of Scotiabank. Through EFICINE 226, Rich offered Ramírez $10 million MXP to be used on whatever project or projects Ramírez wanted to use it for. Ramírez decided to put $5 million MXP towards producing La brújula, and the arrangement was approved through EFICINE in 2009 (Ramírez Interview; México, IMCINE, "Proyectos 2009"). It took a year from approval for the money to come through. Ramírez organized a small team who worked for a month to set up the production schedule. The film was shot in only about five weeks, and then they took a little over a year to edit it, In the end the budget came in just shy of $750,000 USD (Ramírez Interview; E-mail).

[49] Translated from original Spanish.

Completed in 2011, La brújula's world premiere was in competition at the Tokyo International Film Festival in October of that year. It continued a festival run after that. In 2012, the film enjoyed a North American premiere at the Los Angeles Film Festival (also known as LA Film Fest), and formed part of the competitive section for Mexican First Feature at GIFF. In fact at GIFF, it was picked up by Somos TV LLC for distribution on the Pay TV channel ViendoMovies, with a three-year deal for the US and Puerto Rico. According to Claudia Rivera of Somos TV, who was accredited and in attendance for the IPM in 2012, the deal also included media coverage and some promotion for US festivals in 2013 (Rivera LinkedIn; Rivera E-mail). Also in 2012, under Ramírez' initiative, La brújula was awarded funds from the newly established Estímulo a la Promoción de Cine Mexicano (Stimulus for Promotion of Mexican Film, or EPROCINE), which supported a theatrical run of the film in 2013, in Mexico City and other national regional theaters. As of mid June 2013, La brújula had been released in 16 theaters in Mexico with a reported gross box office total of $130,665 MXP. ("Llega 'La brújula'"; Ramírez E-mail).

CONCLUSIONS, GIFF AND THE INTERNATIONAL PITCHING MARKET 2004-2011

As we look back over the intersection of the trajectory of the festival with the production timelines of the two selected films, it is clear that involvement in the event of the IPM constituted one key moment in time in much longer histories. Despite the differences I noted between the projects at the outset of this investigation, a number of similarities stand out between the two IPM experiences. Both films' representatives expressed that they went into the meetings with expectations for immediate results directly linked to the pitching sessions. In retrospect, they have been able to contextualize the place of the IPM in their films' histories, as one of professional development and reorientation for their projects; however, the initial disappointments formed a significant

part of their experiences. The primary take-away in both film study cases seems to be that the experience of preparing for and participating in the IPM facilitated their ability to subsequently see the project through to completion, because it required that they formally package the film in preparation for the market and then pitch it to film industry representatives. Additionally, they gained insight about the nature of film industry business from the opportunity to formally pitch their work in that context. One of those insights could be described as learning how different interests play out with respect to attending such industry events, including that most attendees are not going to be interested in most projects.

If we consider the festival's approach to organizing the IPM through the lens of Rüling's field-configuring event model, where EEC was aiming to intervene in the Mexican industry—an industry in crisis because of its overall insularity and a lack of professional producers—EEC's strategy could be described as one that spread a wide net and tried to get as many people talking to each other as possible. At the core, the idea was to kick-start production of Mexican films. The coordinators could not know exactly which combinations of projects and collaborators might hit it off. Equally they recognized that resources were available but limited. Finally, they also recognized that most creatives with ideas did not know the film business, and that the reverse was true too: "the business" in the form of national and international investors did not know about the filmmakers' projects. To focus attention on the problems, to generate conversation about how to address the weaknesses in the Mexican industry, to start to get excited about future possibilities, what better way to get started than to put people in the room together, both in the forums and also in the one-on-one pitch sessions? The fact that industry change is slow as a rule was calculated as part of the process, as Hoch and other collaborators pointed out in interviews, but they also felt they had to start somewhere. As

noted above, the first few years of the IPM were especially rough in terms of "pitchers" still not really having the process down; EEC/GIFF would attempt to address this in various ways in subsequent years by providing mentoring opportunities for producers, aimed at professionalizing their project presentation. Along the same timeline, the other two major festivals in Mexico, FICG and FICM, would also develop industry initiatives that would tackle this from other angles. As Chapters 5 and 6 will detail, the Encuentro at FICG and Morelia Lab at FICM each took its own approach to the same issues.

Even though substantive and identifiably linked results from IPM meetings are not the norm, the expectation should not be dismissed out of hand, but rather contextualized. It would be great if that could happen for more projects as; after all, project completion is a primary reason that projects apply and attend, and a founding reason for the IPM itself. Direct results from IPM meetings have occurred, in fact. Over the years, filmmakers have attracted collaborators to their projects based on meetings at the IPM. For example, FiGa Films joined the project Los últimos cristeros (The Last Christeros, 2011, Dir. Matias Meyer) based on their meeting in 2010 (Fiorin), and other instances have been identified during the course of this project. One of the most often cited is from the first IPM in 2004. One of the participating projects, Radicales libres (Free Radicals) was picked up, produced, and distributed in Mexico by Warner Bros. under the title Efectos secundarios (Side Effects, 2006, Dir. Issa López). Warner Bros. appointed Leonardo Zimbrón, one of the Mexican producers behind Radicales libres, Director of Local Production at Warner Bros. Mexico in April 2005, where he produced films until the regional production branch closed in 2010 (Hoch Interview 2013; Zimbrón, "Más que una Industra"; Zimbrón Interview). However, at the same time, results like that which Efectos secundarios and Leonardo Zimbrón experienced are not

typical, and because they are exceptional they should not be allowed to obscure other types of short-term or longer-term results.

Year	No. Mexican projects (prod or co-prod)	No. completed by end of 2013	No. with festival screening(s)	No. released Mexico	No. with international release
2004	20	10	7	10	4
2005	20	7	5	7	0
2006	17	6	4	6	1
2007	9	2	2	1	1
2008	2	0	0	0	0
2009	14	3	3	3	1
2010	15	4	4	3	0
2011	21	0	0	0	0

Table 3: Overview of Mexican Projects' Status from the International Pitching Market (IPM) 2004-2011[50]

The case study films for this chapter illustrate two of many possible routes for projects to take from development to realization to exhibition and distribution, if they make it that far. Lebrija and Pons actually did make their films, and their films have reached audiences on various screens including festival, theatrical, and Pay TV. Along the way, one of the steps they took was to participate in an IPM at EEC. Many other Mexican film projects have gone through the IPM from 2004 to 2011, as illustrated in Table 3. As the table also indicates, the overall odds filmmakers face to completion and distribution of their films is quite high. Only 27% (32 out of 118) of the Mexican projects that participated in 2004 through 2011 were completed by end of year 2013. None of the films that participated in the 8IPM in 2011 had yet to be completed; however, this is not

[50] Sources: Data compiled from IMCINE databases and publications; IMDb Pro data; last updated end of year 2013. The above includes only narrative features that participated in the IPM, that signed up as Mexican projects and that listed Mexican producers or coproducers upon completion.

surprising considering that by December of 2013 only 17 months had lapsed since the films participated in the IPM. Based on data collected here, 17 months is not generally enough time for a film to move through production into post-production and release. We can contextualize this if we look a little more closely at an IPM year, for example 2006 the year that La Ticla / Amar a morir went through the 3IPM. If we take into account that films selected for an IPM have already been developed to some extent, likely for at least a year or two based on case study examples, we get a better sense of realistic timelines for a film to reach completion (if it ever does). By end of year 2013, only six of seventeen of the projects from 3IPM in 2006 had been completed. It is also instructive to note that with the exception of one film that was completed in 2007, the other five films including Amar a morir were not completed until at least 2009.

Expanding in-depth research beyond the two case study films could break down these preliminary numbers further. This would include tracking when all of the films first started being worked on, to when they participated in the IPM (including if anything direct resulted from that to move film forward), applied to grants or found coproducers, began production, to when they were completed (if completed), and perhaps other points along the timelines. The information collected by such a study would likely be quite illuminating and useful to informing stakeholders about: (1) realistic expectations for filmmakers who apply to participate in the IPM; (2) what kinds of projects at what stages of realization have proven attractive to what kinds of co-producers and/or investors; and (3) the profiles of producers or other industry investors most likely to be interested in the IPM projects, as well as identifying those experienced enough to see the projects through should they attach themselves to one or more. If these types of factors could be evaluated and assessed quantitatively across a representative sample, it could answer some of the questions about how to maximize outcomes important to the stakeholders: completed

films with potential to sustain livelihoods, and promotion of the circulation of Mexican filmmakers' work on national and international screens.

Based on the above case studies and data, EEC/GIFF as a festival, and the IPM as part of the festival's Industry area, have both provided spaces and opportunities for professional relationships to be developed, and for filmmakers to hone their skills. The festival as it evolved over the years, has worked to build a reputation that will attract significant films and guests, thereby consolidating its position in the film festival circuit as a "must attend" event for people who want to see the latest films by established or new talent. This has required constant reflection on what has worked or not worked, evolving with the film industry, and even attempting to anticipate or shape that evolution. In 2011, as they rebranded from EEC to GIFF, Hoch and Ernesto Herrera, the President of the Expresión en Corto Foundation, wrote a dual introductory statement for the official festival catalog that is revealing of the stakes involved from their perspective.[51] In it, they stated:

> It was not easy to decide to change the name of the festival, we had been considering it for many years and, truthfully, the word "corto [short film]" no longer represented the scope of the festival.
>
> Since its birth it has been an international event, an ambitious platform, with renowned guests, large venues, a focal point for the industry, and a cinematographic program of breadth and quality, however the feedback that we were receiving based on the former name made us feel that it fell short next to the actual content of the festival, and that perception affected us when we were fighting for films and premieres against other festivals. (GIFF, Festival 2011 27)[52]

Their transformation in response to external changes was seen not only as a way to boost their leverage for acquiring films, but also for building their capacity to support and

[51] Ernesto Herrera and Sarah Hoch are also married, and they have worked very much as a team since I have known them, with Herrera especially devoted to the graphic design and audio-visual production of the festival and parallel actitivies.
[52] Translated from original Spanish.

inspire up-and-coming filmmakers, both Mexican and international. Hosting national and international film premieres, filmmakers, and industry attendees, is part of building relationships and festival identity for the future. If successful, the festival establishes a draw that maintains its relevancy as a cultural institution.

It is important to point out how interconnected the "front of house" and Industry areas are in meeting these goals. Both the film festival program, and the IPM and other Industry activities, need to be field-configuring events to sustain each other, as another way to have access to new films and prominent filmmakers is to meet them before they are huge stars. Most of the time this interdependency goes unacknowledged behind the very real overall goal of supporting film arts and artists generally. However, in 2013 Hoch affirmed,

> All film festivals also have a selfish reason for [supporting young filmmakers]. We want their premieres, we want a piece of their films, we want a piece of their future films, we want to be a part of their lives. We do not make them sign a contract that we'll have a premiere; we don't even ask them [...]. We just hope that they will consider us because of their relationship with us, with their next film, or maybe their film five years down the line. We're hoping they'll come back and shoot a film here. (Hoch Interview 2013)

The nod to "selfish reasons" refers to the conscious nature of reputation building by film festivals within the film industry and on the film exhibition circuits—festivals distinguish themselves by their ability to identify and secure the next hot property either first (ideally) or if not first, very early in the exhibition cycle. Relationships with up-and-coming artists, especially before a project is even complete, can provide a festival a jump-start on this relationship. At the same time, Hoch alludes to another aspect of circularity, generating production in Mexico by being good hosts and building strong relationships. Efforts to directly support Mexican commerce do not stop there, either; as noted above, GIFF also has worked actively to have influence on the evolution of the film

industry. In addition to the Bilateral Forums describe above, this aspect might best be reflected in one of the more recent activities added to the Industry slate: the "Think Tank," which first ran as an event in Mexico City in May of 2011, and then was followed up by a meeting organized during the 14th GIFF. The first two meetings were concerned with issues of securing a place for Mexican cinema in streaming technologies, and updating federal laws to protect intellectual property accordingly (GIFF, Festival 2011 283).

That said, GIFF's impact on the evolution of the film industry takes many more subtle paths than forums like the Think Tank. In fact, the core of this study is focused on the IPM for this very reason. By choosing a group of projects to participate in the IPM, the selection committee wields a decent amount of power. Projects that are selected get into press releases, the names of the projects and representatives may be seen by other festival coordinators or interested members of the film community, and the project representatives have the opportunity to expand their networks at the festival and at the IPM; the projects and the creative teams behind them start becoming visible to a festival and film industry network in a way that rejected projects may never become. This visibility, though, on another level is only the start. Films selected for the IPM are not guaranteed anything more by the IPM than the opportunity to pitch their project in that setting. However, by putting these projects into the public eye, GIFF situates itself in the industry as a champion of Mexican filmmakers, as a player invested in the generation of particular forms of media capital.

In conclusion, the complexity of the role of festivals in the film industry landscape provides for both the intrigue and challenge of this research project. Now that we have a picture of EEC/GIFF's history and some of the ways its initiatives have been envisioned, enacted, and experienced, it is time to turn to the other festivals and their

stories. Chapter 5 turns to the FICG and Encuentro de Coproducción. As a festival founded in the 1980s, FICG developed a distinct identity in the years before EEC first launched; FICG also led the way in creating an Industria / Industry area within its festival offerings. The Encuentro, amongst other distinguishing features, set itself apart from the IPM by setting up its meetings by mutual interest of participants. In similar fashion to the IPM, the Encuentro meetings themselves served as a professionalization experience, in what could be described as a learning by doing style. Then, Chapter 6 turns to FICM and Morelia Lab. Of the three festivals, FICM is the youngest in terms of its timeline, but because of the resources available to it at the time it launched, and the experience of its directors, it has made significant impacts on the landscape of the Mexican film industry. The Lab itself as designed was the most distinct of the three primary industry initiatives profiled in this project. Its approach was to provide explicit mentoring and networking resources—less fixated on immediate results than the IPM or Encuentro—in order to lower the stakes and focus clearly on professional development. As will be discussed in this project's concluding chapter, all of these efforts were responsive to their own internal dynamics, to what the other festivals were undertaking, to what was happening in the local industry, and to the changing nature of film festival roles in both national and international contexts. All of these figure in to considerations of their contributions to the renovation of Mexican film production in the past decades.

Chapter 5: Guadalajara: From Mexican Showcase to International Film Festival, Market, and Coproduction Meeting

> When I arrived, there was very little Mexican cinema production. So the proposal was, that with the inclusion of Iberian cinema in the festival, there would be something to sustain the festival that would offset the rise or fall in Mexican production. And we spoke about creating a Market, and creating a Coproduction Meeting. I was more in favor of the Coproduction Meeting because I was a director and I had only made short films; I understood that this was what filmmakers needed most.
> - Kenya Márquez, director of Guadalajara International Film Festival 2002-2005[53]

In this chapter, we turn to the history of Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara (Guadalajara International Film Festival, or FICG) which was founded the "Muestra de Cine Mexicano" (Mexican Film Showcase)[54] in 1986. In the 1980s, economic crises at the national level compounded those faced by the Mexican film industry, resulting in few opportunities for general audiences to view Mexican films on the big screen. One of the most devastating events in Mexican Cinema history happened in 1982, when the Cineteca Nacional (the National Film Archive) in Mexico City suffered a catastrophic fire, in which thousands of films, historical documents, and specialized books and journals were destroyed, along with a number of lives still not all accounted for (Villa-Flores 197). The Cineteca had long been an important venue for the screening of national and international films; while the institution would recover as a screening venue and archive, the loss was still reverberating across the film world when a group of cinephiles in Guadalajara decided they wanted to provide a forum for the viewing of Mexican films with filmmakers, critics, scholars in attendance.

Although Mexican feature film production numbers were nowhere near as low in the mid-1980s as they would be by the mid-1990s, national production was dominated by

---

[53] Kenya Márquez, personal interview, 17 May 2013. Translated from Spanish.

[54] The Muestra de Cine Mexicano is rarely translated into English. When translated, it is called a Showcase, but in common usage in English, the Muestra de Cine Mexicano is not translated, and for short is simply called the "Muestra."

commercial fare; independent films were in the minority, and enjoyed almost no access to theatrical exhibition channels. The tone and reputation of the festival in Guadalajara, as an antidote to what was happening in commercial production and distribution windows, was set by three key people whose efforts brought it to life. One of these was Jaime Humberto Hermosillo, an independent filmmaker who lived and worked in Guadalajara, and whose involvement with the group Cine y Crítica (Cinema and Criticism) informed him that there was interest in the region in access to contemporary Mexican independent cinema. The second was Emilio García Riera, renowned film critic and historian, who was influential not only in bringing resources to the festival directly, but also in establishing the Centro de Investigación y Enseñanza Cinematográficas (Center for Cinematographic Training and Research, or CIEC), which would open in 1986 just a few months after the first festival. The CIEC would become a national center for teaching film history, film criticism, and filmmaking, as well as a leader in academic circles in terms of publications on Mexican film history and criticism, supported by the University of Guadalajara Press. These two collaborators were joined by a third, Raúl Padilla López who, as an administrator at the University of Guadalajara (UDG), leveraged resources and support for the initiative; Padilla has backed the festival in various capacities since its founding through the timeframe covered by this study.

The direction of the Muestra de Cine/FICG has changed hands fairly regularly since its inaugural edition in 1986. What has remained consistent is its intimate connection with the Universidad de Guadalajara (the University of Guadalajara, or UDG)—its resources, including facilities, students, faculty and other personnel, have supported the annual film festival since the beginning. From the first edition of the

"Muestra de Cine Mexicano" (Mexican Film Showcase)[55] the festival has worked to develop a reputation of an auteur-oriented platform, with national cinema and filmmakers at the core of its activities. From the earliest Muestras in the late 1980s, the festival's coordinators have programmed series of film screenings, question and answer sessions, panels, and roundtables. As will be discussed in this chapter, the latter were often organized around topics of interest to Mexican filmmakers who wanted more artistic freedom, and the means to work outside of the constraints of commercial sector demands. During the 1990s, the Muestra would face the crises in Mexican cinema, responding with a number of organizational changes that would continue into the 2000s. In the early 2000s, the "Muestra de Cine Mexicano en Guadalajara" (Guadalajara Mexican Film Showcase) began to expand its festival selections and revise its protocol, including working to transform its identity into that of a leading Ibero-American festival—while still focusing on the Mexican film industry as a key component to its screenings and parallel sections. The festival would officially adopt the title of the Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara (FICG, Guadalajara International Film Festival) for its 20th anniversary in 2005.

A couple of years before the festival's official name change, the Muestra's coordinators opened the "Mercado de Cine Iberoamericano" (Ibero-American Film Market). The Mercado / Market in Guadalajara was designed to promote feature films from the Iberian Peninsula and Latin America seeking exhibition and/or distribution deals. Notably, until 2009 when Ventana Sur opened in Argentina,[56] the FICG Mercado

---

[55] The Muestra de Cine Mexicano is rarely translated into English. When translated, it is called a Showcase, but in common usage in English, the Muestra de Cine Mexicano is not translated, and for short is simply called the "Muestra."

[56] Ventana Sur was established in 2009 in Buenos Aires, Argentina, as a joint effort between the Instituto Nacional de Cine y Artes Audiovisuales (National Institute for Film and Audiovisula Arts, or INCAA) and the Marché du Film of the Cannes Film Festival.

was the only major film sales market in the Americas dedicated to promoting Ibero-American projects. Within a couple years of establishing the Mercado for completed films, FICG began adding initiatives to support film projects in development, production, and post-production stages. These activities would consolidate into an official "Industria / Industry" area. Additionally, FICG would add over the years "Formación / Formation" components, with activities explicitly aimed at mentoring filmmakers through various stages of their professional formation—for example, lab or seminar series for filmmaker participants, selected through an application process.

In Guadalajara, since the first year of the Film Market to the time of this writing, there has been a very clear distinction between the "front of house" film screenings, and the Industry activities which take place out of that spotlight. As a continuation of its founding principals as a "muestra" or film showcase, the Guadalajara Film Festival has every year curated a variety of film programs for attendees. Most of the people who have attended film screenings during the festival in recent years were likely unaware of FICG's Industry area, or at least they are not attendees of those events, as registration for Industry activities has been limited to people who work in the film industry by pre-selection and application procedures.[57] However, the reverse is not the case. Accreditation with an Industry badge grants broad access to Industry activities, as well as priority access to festival film screenings. A good deal of FICG's annual events have celebrated the public red carpet screenings, gala events, and star presence at many of the film presentations—this holds true as well for FICG's contemporary counterparts, the Guanajuato International Film Festival (GIFF, formerly Expresión en Corto; in this project abbreviated EEC/GIFF when referring to the trajectory from origin in 1998

[57] In this project, I use a capital "I" for Industry when referring to the particular events, activities, and organization that a festival—in this case FICG—identifies as its "Industria" or "Industry" area, in contrast to the general film festival activities.

through 2011) and the Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia (FICM, Morelia International Film Festival, founded in 2003).

Of primary focus for this project, we investigate the first film production support initiative launched at FICG, the "Encuentro Iberoamericano de Coproducción Cinematográfico" (Ibero-American Coproduction Meeting, or the "Encuentro")[58] which opened in 2005. Less than one year prior to this, in Guanajuato in July of 2004, the festival "Expresión en Corto" (EEC)[59] had coordinated and hosted the nation's first International Pitching Market (IPM). Although both Guadalajara and Guanajuato created "Markets," it is very important to distinguish between the two—FICG's Mercado featured completed films seeking distribution and/or exhibition outlets, while EEC's IPM focused on film projects in development (incomplete projects), seeking financing or other coproduction support. In that regard, the IPM and the Encuentro were more aligned in their missions: both sought to create a meeting space in which representatives of films in early stages of development or production would present their projects to other industry members. The idea in both instances was that collaborations might develop through the meetings, towards the completion of the participating projects. Distinct from the IPM, the Encuentro included from its inception international projects within its selection, representing Mexico and other Ibero-American countries. In a similar manner to the IPM, the Encuentro was not designed as a mentoring program, but instead as a meeting between professionals. As will be discussed later in the chapter, the fact that especially during the Encuentro's early years many Mexican filmmakers were not fully prepared for such a meeting, meant that professional formation as part of the process was alternately

[58] Per the Introduction of this project, it is most common for industry professionals to refer to it in the original Spanish name of "Encuentro de Coproducción" or "Encuentro" for short, as opposed to in English translation.
[59] See Chapter 1, note 4.

implicitly and explicitly acknowledged. Those with their eyes on the development of a more robust Mexican film industry would also respond, by focusing attention and resources on mentoring initiatives, and the three major film festivals of the time, FICG, EEC, and FICM, would all be hubs for these activities.

In parallel to the previous chapter discussing EEC/GIFF, the current chapter is also divided into four major sections. The first is a historical overview of the Muestra de Cine from the inaugural showcase in 1986 through the realization of the 26th FICG in 2011.[60] The second is a discussion of the establishment of FICG as an industry player, in support of Ibero-American cinema, initially through the Mercado / Film Market and subsequently through other initiatives including the Encuentro de Coproducción. The chapter then delves into two case studies, specifically Cinco días sin Nora (Nora's Will, 2008, Dir. Mariana Chenillo), which was one of ten projects representing Mexico chosen to participate in the first Encuentro in 2005, and Vaho (Becloud, 2009, Dir. Alejandro Gerber Bicecci) which was one of seven Mexican projects selected for the 2007 Encuentro. In parallel to the other film study cases covered in Chapters 4 and 6, in this chapter the two films' participation at the Encuentro illuminate some of the considerations that went into filmmakers' decisions to apply and attend, as well as an analysis of the pros and cons of having done so. Finally, in the fourth section, the discussion turns to an overview of the first seven Encuentros, including consideration of data on completion of participating projects within the context of the festival's history, as well as in the context of the Mexican film industry in the early 2000s.

[60] While some comments and illustrative examples may include festival information for more recent years, the main purview of the study in terms of festival years and the Encuentro de Coproducción runs through 2011, for consistency across dissertation chapters.

As a point of pride and a testament to its resilience, FICG holds the distinction as the longest running film festival in the country.[61] During the past decades, the organization has adapted to the fluctuations in national production and adjusted to trends on national and international fronts, including competition from newer festivals after their founding, including EEC/GIFF and FICM. The Industry initiatives formed part of strategic decisions to keep FICG relevant nationally, as well as establishing it as a leader on the world stage. The discussion in this chapter of the festival's trajectory, including a close look at the Encuentro and two participant film case studies, will bring us back around to the ideas posed throughout this project: long-term visions are necessary for analysis of festival initiatives, and any given initiative functions as part of a complex organization where immediate judgment of "success" or "failure" is challenging at best. These analyses also must keep in mind the interconnectedness of stakeholders who invest in and benefit from the success of the festival and its Industry activities. In this case, as with EEC/GIFF, the complexity is staggering, but we can start by looking at the basics most pertinent to this project. Who founded the festival? What directions has leadership taken the festival? In what ways have stakeholders adapted over the years to establish and maintain FICG's relevancy on the international festival circuit? Where does the Encuentro fit into the history. What are some impacts it has had on participants? As before, Ragan Rhyne's stakeholder model, Charles-Clemens Rüling's concept of festivals as "field-configuring events," and Michael Curtin's analysis of media capital flow and exchange, inform the overall direction of inquiries.

[61] By the close of 2013, the Cineteca Nacional in Mexico City had held 55 editions of the Muestra Internacional de Cine (International Film Showcase), an event founded in 1971 (México. Cineteca Nacional). As the Cineteca's Muestra has not to date converted formally into a film festival, FICG is celebrated as Mexico's longest-running film festival.

Initial findings indicate some benchmarks that could be used to evaluate "success" or "failure," both of the event itself as an institutional activity, as well as with regards to filmmaker's experiences as they navigate any given production. In this chapter, one of the case study projects, Cinco diás sin Nora, actually did formalize a coproduction relationship as a result of the Encuentro. Filmmaker expectations from the Encuentro, as with the IPM, may be geared towards a result like this, yet in most cases immediate results are elusive. As part of the production cycle of a film, and the continued viability of a completed film to reach audiences, the Encuentro is best analyzed as one of many opportunities that filmmakers may seek to participate in as they work on their projects. Analytical benchmarks primarily include considering to what extent the activities of the Encuentro served to (1) create additional spaces for networking and opportunities for professionalization of attendees and (2) offer a platform for project representatives to present their work to national and international industry players whom they might otherwise not have the chance to meet. Because of the nature of the film business, in which many more projects exist as ideas than will ever get made, industry players routinely rely on filtering systems to help them sort through options, reducing the number of projects they review that do not fit what they are looking for. One such system can be festival initiatives such as the Encuentro, that pre-filter projects and select only a top few for the privileged meeting opportunity. In addition to selecting projects and facilitating industry meetings, the Encuentro also offered awards to projects, which could also serve as an analytical benchmark. Since neither Cinco días nor Vaho won awards, this part of the analysis is addressed briefly in the final segment of this chapter with reference to another project. As the upcoming discussion will demonstrate, the Encuentro has served as a platform for selected filmmakers to network with a good number of film industry players in a short amount of time, against the backdrops of an international film festival

and the FICG's official Ibero-American Film Market. The Encuentro's realization has also been influential in local and national strategies to cultivate a network of professional producers in Mexico in the 2000s.

The coordinators of the first "Muestra de Cine Mexicano" likely did not envision all the transformations their showcase would undergo on the way to becoming one of the most important film festivals in Mexico, and a world leader in the support of the Ibero-American film industry. In the first main section of this chapter, we take a look at the history of the Muestra, the path it took to becoming the FICG, and its corresponding moves from exhibitor to industry innovator.

OVERVIEW: FROM "MUESTRA DE CINE MEXICANO" TO "GUADALAJARA INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL"

Unlike both GIFF and the Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia (Morelia International Film Festival, or FICM), the Muestra/FICG has evolved through time under different Coordinators (the title used from years 1986-1996) and Directors (the title used from 1997-present). What has remained consistent, from the time of its founding to this writing, is that the festival has counted on the executive leadership of Raúl Padilla López, and an alliance with the UDG for its realization.

The trajectory from 1986 through 2011 may be constructively discussed in two primary historical periods. The first period runs from 1986 through 2001 during which the festival's identity was most anchored in the founding vision of being a Mexican film showcase. In the early years, from 1986 through 1995, the festival established itself as an influential event, despite national economic crises and a devastating decline in Mexican national cinema. In 1996, the Instituto Mexicano de la Cinematografía (the Mexican Cinematographic Institute, or IMCINE) came on board as a major coordinating partner of the Muestra. Also beginning in 1996, the festival would go through four changes of

leadership in six years, as it struggled with both the uneven output of the Mexican film industry and criticism of a perceived elitist and insular coordinating body.

The second major historical period, which begins in 2002, is marked by concerted efforts to reorient and rebrand the festival. This era begins with the appointment of filmmaker Kenya Márquez to the position of Festival Director, just a few months before the 2002 Muestra. In addition to this change, beginning in 2002, two major changes were put into motion that would take some time to complete: (1) the Muestra's coordinating leaders began to develop its Industry area by launching the Mercado de Cine Iberoamericano in 2003; (2) the Muestra's identity began to be shifted from a Mexican showcase towards an international film festival with an Ibero-American focus. The latter shift would result in the rebranding of the festival on its 20th anniversary in 2005, when the name of the Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara would become official, including the acronym FICG. After this, Jorge Sánchez Sosa was named Director in 2006; as someone with independent production and distribution experience, he took particular interest in the Industry area of the festival. Under his leadership, Industry at FICG was further established as a "must attend" event for anyone in Ibero-American film production or sales. Following Sánchez Sosa's departure, Iván Trujillo took over direction of FICG in time for its 2011 edition. Amongst other accolades, Trujillo is known as a filmmaker and for serving as director of the Filmoteca of the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (National Autonomous University of Mexico, or UNAM) from 1989 to 2008. All in all, even with the reorientation towards featuring Spain and Latin American content, the FICG by 2011 had built a solid track record of supporting Mexican filmmakers through its festival "front of house" and its Industry "behind the screens" activities.

The historical overview of the FICG begins by discussing the years 1986 to 2001, which precede the establishment of the first Ibero-American Film Market; this is followed by an overview of the festival trajectory as it launched and grew the multiple facets of its Industry area.

Muestra de Cine Mexicano Prior to the First Guadalajara Film Market, 1986 to 2001

In the mid 1980s, Mexico as a nation was in the middle of economic crisis; the film community in particular was trying to recover from the devastation of the Cineteca Nacional fire, as well as the dismantling of national infrastructure for film production and exhibition. There were a little over 2,000 film screens operating in the country. The box office was dominated by imported as opposed to national films (Línea de tiempo; "Películas estrenadas"). With little state support, filmmakers found themselves forced to choose between the available commercial filmmaking opportunities, or to work on their own. This meant there were few viable independent filmmakers in the mid 1980s, who found it hard to reach any audience even if they were able to complete films. Despite all of this, interestingly, hundreds of miles away from the nation's capital, a group of cinephiles organized the first Muestra de Cine Mexicano en Guadalajara as an initiative through the UDG.

The principal architects behind launching the 1986 Muestra were the filmmaker Jaime Humberto Hermosillo, the film critic and historian Emilio García Riera, and Raúl Padilla López, who at the time was in charge of Dirección de Investigación Científica y Superación Académica (DISCA, basically the Direction of Scientific Inquiry and Academic Improvement) for the UDG. Hermosillo and García Riera both were already active in film-related activities in Guadalajara, as well as connected to the UDG. They were equally interested in supporting the production of more Mexican independent film

as well as the presentation of those films to Mexican audiences. As a filmmaker, Hermosillo had a relatively substantial body of work across shorts and features by 1986, including winning the top Mexican Golden Ariel Award for La pasión según Berenice (The Passion According to Berenice, 1975) and for Naufragio (Shipwreck, 1977). In Guadalajara he had found others who were interested in working on film as well as studying it critically. García Riera was a tireless film critic, historian, and advocate for Mexican film, best known for his eighteen volume life's work Historia documental del cine mexicano (Documentary History of Mexican Film). At the same time as García Riera helped organize the first Muestra, was also concerned with founding the CIEC, which would open officially a few months after the first Muestra (Martín 13; Padilla López, "Consolidando" 205). For his part, Padilla López has been a major force behind the event from the beginning, through his position as Rector of the UDG (from 1989 to 1995), to serving as President of the Patronato del Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara (the Guadalajara International Film Festival Foundation).

The first ten years of the Muestra de Cine Mexicano were coordinated by three people in succession.[62] Jaime Humberto Hermosillo (1986-1988, corresponding to the 1st through 3rd editions), Jaime Larios (1989, 4th edition), and Mario Aguiñaga Ortuño (1990-1995, 5th through 10th editions). The first few years of the Muestra, coordinated by Hermosillo, would set a tone for future years by balancing the primary goals of: (1) screening new Mexican short and feature films; (2) supporting film students by screening their work; and (3) screening a retrospective of a Mexican director's work. The organizing committee of the first Muestra included Daniel Varela, who worked with

[62] From 1986 through 1996, the primary organizer was referred to generally as "Coordinator" and from 1997 to the present, as "Director."

Hermosillo on the film Doña Herlinda y su hijo (1985, Doña Herlinda and Her Son), film student Guillermo del Toro, who was just beginning his career, amongst others.

Although the first Muestra was on one level modest, on another it was quite ambitious. The team had at their disposal two screening venues: the Instituto Cabañas (the Cabañas Cultural Institute) and the Museo Regional (the Regional Museum of Guadalajara). The low number of films screened reflected the state of the industry, as the final selection of films included twelve narrative features, eight of which were directed by Hermosillo himself. Essentially the narratives showcased two retrospectives of respected Mexican filmmakers—one a collection of five films by various Mexican directors, plus a showcase of additional films by Hermosillo. The five Mexican features that headlined the Muestra represent some of the best of Mexican film, not just then but through the industry's history: Retrato de una mujer casada (A Married Woman, 1979, Dir. Alberto Bojórquez); El día que murió Pedro Infante (The Day Pedro Infante Died, 1983, Dir. Claudio Isaac); Los motivos de Luz (Luz's Reasons, 1985, Dir. Felipe Cazals); Doña Herlinda y su hijo (1985, Dir. Hermosillo); and Frida (1986, Dir. Paul Leduc). The full program included these five films, the seven-film Hermosillo retrospective, a selection of seven short and medium-length films, as well as two feature documentaries. The short and medium-length films brought together student films from the major films schools located in Mexico City, the Centro Universitario de Estudios Cinematográficos (University Center for Cinematographic Studies, or CUEC) and the Centro de Capacitación Cinematográfica (CCC), and two films by young Guadalajaran filmmakers, including del Toro's 1985 medium-length "Doña Lupe" (XX años 21-23).

In total, twenty-one works screened, however, from the beginning the Muestra was not only about these screenings. The organizers facilitated question-and-answer sessions between filmmakers and the audience, engaging the public as much as possible

with the screening not just as consumption, but also as an art that depends on viewer engagement. The coordinating team also assembled many national and international figures; the international invitees featured Elliott Stein (USA), Robin Wood (Canada), Diego Galán (Spain), and Manuel Pérez Estremera (Spain). As one of the events in addition to screenings, guests of the festival participated in a round table with Mexican filmmakers called "El guión cinematográfico / The Screenplay" (XX años 19-21). After returning home to Canada, Wood, a respected film critic and scholar, wrote glowingly of both Hermosillo's work as a filmmaker and the festival experience itself. With respect to the festival, Wood pointed to two aspects in particular that stood out to him as inspirational: "First, there is a real sense of community, of a creative workshop in which ideas are exchanged, enthusiasms developed, excitement generated. Second, these are people who actually love movies" (38). This format, of screenings of Mexican films, audience interaction with Mexican films and filmmakers, and parallel activities connecting the Mexican filmmakers with members of the international film community, shaped the foundation of the Muestra; this base morphed, retracting or expanding over the years, into what became the FICG.

The years following the first Muestra benefitted from a couple changes: first, the establishment of the CIEC, a formal film studies program at the UDG between the first and second Muestras; second, improvement in venue options for the events. The second year included a program of ten features, ten shorts, and an eleven-film retrospective of José Estrada's work. Interestingly, some of the second Muestra reprised films from the first (XX años 209-10). The third Muestra, in 1988, marked the first time that the University counted on its own major theater space, the brand new "Cine Foro," as one of the venues. That year the Muestra also boasted seven feature film premieres by directors recognized for their commitment to artistic integrity, one a first feature but the rest from

directors with previous features under their belts. These screenings were supplemented by a retrospective of fourteen films by Felipe Cazals, and an impressive number of twenty-six short, mid-length and documentary films. The third Muestra also ran activities parallel to the film program: the conference "El surgimiento del cine hispano en Estados Unidos / The Rise of Hispanic Film in the United States" by Eduardo Díaz; the roundtable "El cine independiente / Independent Film" coordinated by Alejandro Pelayo; and the roundtable "La difícil relación: cineasta-crítico-público / The Difficult Relationship: Filmmaker-Critic-Audience" led by Eduardo Maldonado (XX años 35-37, 39).

The fourth through tenth editions of the Muestra may be characterized as not only surviving tough times, but actively attempting to counter any attitude of resignation or despair on the part of the Mexican independent filmmaking community, as many were inclined to feel this way in the face of economic and political crises. Through the CIEC, the support of Emilio García Riera remained constant, and regarding the state of the industry in 1989, he declared, "Filmmaking as a true vocation not only has not ceased to exist in this country, it appears to be growing in the face of adversity." In 1989 the Muestra celebrated its fourth year, and García Riera described it as such: "if true vocation is demonstrated through [completed] films, we want to prove, by exhibiting them, that an unwavering support of a dignified and solvent Mexican cinema is worth the effort" (both quotes in XX años 43).[63] That same year was the only one in which Jaime Larios served as coordinator, marking the transition between Hermosillo's leadership and Mario Aguiñaga's tenure.

The fourth Muestra kept the tone and basic plan of previous years, sticking to an entirely Mexican film showcase, featuring some works still considered benchmarks. A

[63] Translated from original Spanish.

particular item to note from that year was the introduction of video as a format within the showcase; two films shot by Hermosillo on video were presented on video as opposed to film (XX años 39). Buzz about that even permeated academic reviews of the festival, published by Dennis West in INTI, Revista de literatura hispánica and Hispania, in which he discussed Hermosillo's innovative video La tarea (Homework, 1989) and Felipe Cazals' video project Las inocentes (1986-88). West pointed to the difficulties that directors in Mexico faced to create films outside of programmatic genre films, which he described as "well-worn narrative formulas in the unimaginative pursuit of commercially attractive subjects such as sex, drugs, crime, and violence"; the private sector that dominated production had no interest in "serious filmmaking" ("Confronting" 215). In a time when Mexico as a nation was producing a high number of films, few were of quality, as money for that type of filmmaking was hard to come by. Overall, West credited the Muestra with presenting the "best of recent Mexican film production" ("Mexican" 595). About Hermosillo's work he wrote,

> This intelligently scripted narrative offers an engaging and in-depth look at a couple's relationship [...]. According to the director-scriptwriter, the total cost of production equaled the price of a single video cassette. La tarea, however, remains an interesting exercise without commercial potential. ("Confronting" 218)

West's discussion of Cazals' film also revealed the possibility inherent in the medium, stating:

> Although a print [...] never did reach the festival, the work generated considerable interest and discussion because it is one of the first Mexican productions shot in video and transferred to 35mm. If acceptable image quality can be attained in the 35mm transfer, this low-cost mode of production could prove a boon to Mexican and all Third World filmmakers. (218)

At the time, this approach put the Muestra and these filmmakers at the forefront of new trends in filmmaking and exhibition.

From 1990 through 1995, the Muestra would begin to expand its purview under the coordination of Aguiñaga. In 1990, for the fifth Muestra, the festival consolidated geographically, essentially headquartered out of the Hotel Lafayette, which was within walking distance of the three screening venues. International invites continued to be impressive, including Paul Lenti of Variety and José María Prado from the Filmoteca Española. The selection represented the mainstay program sections, eight Mexican feature films, eleven short and mid-length films primarily from film schools, a video section—with a new work by Hermosillo screened for a private audience, and Cazals' film Las inocentes screened on video—and a retrospective of Paul Leduc's work. New program ideas complimented these, starting with a retrospective of seven Mexican films from the 1930s, including two of Fernando de Fuentes' celebrated works, El compadre Mendoza (Godfather Mendoza, 1933) and Allá en el Rancho Grande (Out at the Big Ranch, 1936). Additionally, a section of international productions with connections to Mexico formed an "Invited Films" section: Santa Sangre (Holy Blood, 1989) an Italy/Mexico co-production, directed by Mexican filmmaker Alejandro Jodorowsky; Break of Dawn (1988) directed by Isaac Artenstein, a US production featuring Mexican actors Óscar Chávez and María Rojo; and Barroco (1989) directed by Leduc, and primarily a Cuban/Spanish co-production (XX años 51-55). In addition to facilitated audience discussions typical of previous editions, the Muestra in 1989 hosted presentations for two of CIEC's recent book publications, Alfred Hitchcock by Guillermo del Toro, and Raúl de Anda by Eduardo de la Vega (57).

During the subsequent years through the tenth edition in 1995, the Muestra continued to take on more of the shape of an international film festival. By this, I mean that the Muestra expanded its selection and activities with film program variety, new parallel types of functions, and new partnerships including those that permitted the

Muestra to start offering awards in some of the film sections. Additionally, international trade publications including Variety started to cover the Muestra, and some of the Muestra's selections also appeared in major world film festivals, sometimes before and sometimes after their screening in Guadalajara. As coordinator, Aguiñaga oversaw these transitional years leading up to the formation of the "Patronato" or the Foundation in 1995, a non-profit that has worked in parallel to other coordinating partners, as fundraiser and provide for a formal organizing structure (FICG, "Patronato"). The upcoming paragraphs elaborate on each of these points.

The ninth Muestra, which took place in 1994, serves to illustrate the general trends of the Aguiñaga years, as the festival took on a more international character than had the editions prior to his appointment. The festival's selection of Mexican films showcased nine features, eleven shorts, and a retrospective of seven films by Ismael Rodríguez. The nine feature-length films included only two first feature debuts; the rest were by veteran filmmakers, including such figures as Arturo Ripstein, Luis Estrada, and Paul Leduc. The Audience Award at the Muestra de Guadalajara went to Fernando Sariñana's first feature, Hasta morir ('Til Death, 1994). In addition to a trophy, the Audience Award carried with it a cash award as well as film stock. Hasta morir also received a mention from the Organización Católica Internacional del Cine y el Audiovisual (the International Catholic Organisation for Cinema, or OCIC). The International Critics Award, as well as the award presented by the critics of the Mexican film magazine Dicine, went to Ripstein's Principio y fin (The Beginning and the End, 1993), a film that had won the Concha de Oro (the Golden Shell Award) at the 1993 San Sebastián International Film Festival (XX años 91-93).

Also of note, Paul Lenti of Variety filed a number of film reviews from the Muestra selection that year, including of Hasta morir and Desiertos Mares (Desert Seas,

1993, Dir. José Luis García Agraz) among others. Lenti's commentaries demonstrated a nuanced recognition of the challenges facing Mexican filmmakers, balanced with identification of the promise that some of their work held. For example, regarding Desiertos Mares, he remarked, "The director has lovingly re-created the past and his vision of his parents, giving this world the complexity of life as seen through the eyes of a confused 10-year-old. Unfortunately, the rest of the film lacks this multidimensional vision." When reflecting on Hasta morir Lenti wrote, "Overall, the film admirably manages to conjure up this marginal world of violence and street gangs," and he praised the soundtrack of contemporary Mexican music. Ultimately, in his estimation, "Sarinana could stand to forget a few tricks he learned in film school [...]. But the modern theme and youth-driven story carry the day, and pic should find considerable offshore interest." While none of Lenti's 1994 Muestra reviews could be described as unreservedly glowing, many of them identified positive points in their objects and a few seemed optimistic about the films' futures on the art house circuit.

The short films that same year were no less remarkable in their quality, as judged by their reviews and subsequent accolades. They represented six produced through IMCINE, two from the CCC, two local productions, and one short documentary produced out of the CUEC. The critics at Dicine gave special mention to the quality of the shorts, signaling out El héroe (The Hero, 1993, Dir. Carlos Carrera), Peor es nada (Better than Nothing, 1994, Dir. Javier Bourges), and Ponchada (Flat, 1994, Dir. Alejandra Moya). After the Muestra, the two short films El héroe and Ponchada went on to screen at Cannes, where Carlos Carrera won the Palme d'Or for Best Short Film for El héroe (91-93, 97). The tribute to Ismael Rodríguez, who perhaps is best known for working with major stars including Pedro Infante, was notable because it took the risk by showing

critically esteemed works by the director, as opposed to the ones that were considered his most popular (93).

Two other film sections, as well as some parallel activities dedicated to film history and criticism, rounded out the Muestra's program in 1994. They demonstrate its commitment to building on its reputation as a supporter of auteur filmmakers and a forum for the screening and discussion of quality film. The film sections showcased (1) a selection of five invited high-profile films that featured Mexican talent and/or production teams, for example the acclaimed Fresa y chocolate (Strawberry and Chocolate, 1993, Dir. Tomás Gutiérrez Alea and Juan Carlos Tabío) and (2) an Ibero-American selection, many of which were of world-class distinction, including the Oscar-winning documentary The Panama Deception (1992, Dir. Barbara Trent) and the festival darling comedy/drama La estrategia del caracol (The Snail's Strategy, 1993, Dir. Sergio Cabrera).

As it had previously, the Muestra did not only put the spotlight on film screenings, but also on film history and studies. The CIEC presented its latest film history publications on Mexican cinema and filmmakers, including a number of volumes in the series Historia documental del cine mexicano / Documentary History of Mexican Film by García Riera, and the second volume in the series of "Testimonios" (translatable as Testimonies or Testimonials), entitled Felipe Cazals habla de su cine / Felipe Cazals Talks about His Films with Leonardo García Tsao. While these endeavors focused on Mexico's history, the Coloquio de Historiadores de Cine (the Colloquium of Cinema Historians) brought together a number of guests from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Mexico, Peru, Spain, Uruguay, the US, and Venezuela. During the Colloquium, the discussion focused on the transition from silent to sound cinemas, and how this played out in respective film industries (XX años 97). With events such as these, the Muestra

had set a tone as an annual site for serious conversation and debate about film history and issues.

All in all, 1994 was a landmark year for the Muestra. The subsequent year boasted a number of remarkable events, perhaps none bigger than the opening of the festival with a pristine print of The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari (1920, Dir. Robert Wiene) with live accompaniment by pianist and composer Dimitri Dudin. However, the mood in 1995 was overshadowed by a number of changes, the effects of which on the Muestra were yet to be determined. Perhaps the most preoccupying situation on everyone's mind was the devaluation of the Mexican Peso relative to the US Dollar in December of 1994. As mentioned before, 1995 marked the year the Padilla López moved from Rector of the UDG to the Presidency of the Foundation. In the short term, the Muestra survived by hosting a ten-day festival in honor of its tenth edition, screening an ambitious 57 features and ten short films in six venues. According to festival records, the public responded, with attendance at 33,000 that year (XX años 101; X Muestra 1). Between the tenth and eleventh Muestras, elections determined a new President in office in Mexico's capital, and a new governor of the State of Jalisco, of a different political party than the previous governor.

By 1996, the economic crisis firmly caught up with the Muestra. This year marked a number of changes for the Muestra that would distinguish a new path for the festival. First, the Muestra entered a period of time, corresponding to the crisis in the country, where Mexican film production suffered terribly (refer to Table 1 in Introduction) and therefore programming new Mexican feature films became even more difficult than it had been. Second, a new Rector served at lead of the UDG, and at roughly the same time, Aguiñaga's tenure as Coordinator of the Muestra ended. A number of replacements followed in quick succession over the subsequent years from

1996 through 2001. Bertha Navarro served as Coordinator for the 1996 edition; Leonardo García Tsao as Director for 1997; Susana López Aranda as Director for 1998-1999, the thirteenth and fourteenth editions of the Muestra; and Guillermo Vaidovits Schnuerer was appointed Director for 2000- 2001, corresponding to the fifteenth and sixteenth Muestras de Cine Mexicano en Guadalajara (Carrillo). Third, IMCINE came on board as a major coordinating and financial partner (Martín 14), marking a change in direction and commitment within IMCINE under new leadership, as Ignacio Durán handed over the reins to Jorge Alberto Loyoza, that would not only benefit the Muestra but also other aspects of national cinema.

The eleventh Muestra, which took place in 1996, also coincided with a celebration of 100 years of cinema in Mexico. The retrospective of silent films from Latin America, along with a number of other special presentations and invited international films, helped to offset the fact that the Muestra included only eight new Mexican feature films, half of which were Televicine productions (XX años 113). Reportedly, the International Jury commented:

> The films in competition demonstrate an unsettling decline in production quality, which begs for reengagement from the State, parallel to a renewed private sector presence. Continuous development and national and international projection by the Muestra de Cine Mexicano depends in large part on the increase at the level of production, as much as on the will of filmmakers to reassess their cinematographic language and work more in depth on the script. (qtd. in XX años 111)[64]

These weak points characterize the next few years of film production in the country, which would not exceed 28 features per annum until 2003. IMCINE's efforts to bolster production did start to take shape in 1995 under Loyoza, and continued even as IMCINE's leadership changed hands four more times in as many years, finally stabilizing

[64] Translated from original Spanish.

a bit under Alfredo Joskowicz who held the post from December 2000 through 2006. The situation at IMCINE, and the initiatives undertaken there to prop up industrial production, were especially relevant to the Muestra as IMCINE worked so closely with the team in Guadalajara. Both entities were invested in bringing attention to Mexican films nationally and internationally, and even during the economic downturn in the country, the Muestra was poised to do just that.

From 1996 through 2001, the Muestra focused on what had become its primary strengths: bringing together national and international guests to its forums, exhibiting Mexican film and video alongside retrospectives and films from other countries, discussing the history of cinema, and dreaming of the promise of the future. By 1998, the Muestra regularly attracted big stars, and that year the director Pedro Almodóvar along with the actor Marisa Paredes attended the festival, as the Muestra dedicated space to a twelve-film Almodóvar retrospective. The introductory remarks in the catalog for 1998, the thirteenth edition of the Muestra, serve to illustrate IMCINE's direct investment by this point in the festival, as well as the dire situation in Mexican national filmmaking. The director of IMCINE at the time, Eduardo Amerena, wrote, "This showcase has achieved consolidation and maturity, and has become the most important forum in national and international spheres for exhibiting our most recent film productions" (XIII Muestra 11).[65] He followed this by discussing the four feature films and seven short films, supported by IMCINE, that were set to participate in the thirteenth Muestra. Interestingly, the feature films include the acclaimed documentary ¿Quién diablos es Juliette? (Who the Hell is Juliette, 1997, Dir. Carlos Marcovich), and Hermosillo's most recent film, De noche vienes, Esmeralda (Esmeralda Comes by Night, 1997) an

[65] Translated from original Spanish.

adaptation of a novella by beloved Mexican writer Elena Poniatowska. In all, IMCINE-supported films represented half of the Mexican feature film selection that year, and comprised seven of the nine shorts in official selection.

IMCINE also coordinated two parallel events during the festival. The first, an assembly of the Conferencia de Autoridades Cinematográficas de Iberoamérica (Conference of Ibero-American Cinematographic Authorities, or CACI) was organized to bring together a group of leaders from the member organizations, from cinematographic institutions from the Iberian Peninsula and Latin America, to discuss policies that could bolster cinema in the region. The second, a meeting between Mexican and Spanish producers, was inspired by the idea of fostering future coproduction alliances (Amerena, in XIII Muestra 11). As with previous years, the Muestra fleshed out its offerings with activities including special presentations of books about Mexican film, and a special exhibit of graphic work by the filmmaker and cartoonist Alberto Isaac, entitled "De cine y otros milagritos" / "Of Film and other Little Miracles." Isaac had recently passed away, and in addition to the honor of the exhibit, a brand new logo for the Muestra was dedicated to him (XX años 137). As always, these elements honoring the past were couched in optimism—whether realistic or not—for future years. Amerena pointed to IMCINE's optimism in the close of his introductory remarks, stating that IMCINE:

> [R]eiterates its commitment to continue supporting and participating with its film productions, now that the institute is beginning a time during which it will increase its output. Thus, it will be present in Guadalajara in upcoming years, with more and higher quality films. (XIII Muestra 12)[66]

It is notable that two of the most important films to emerge from Mexico in the early 2000s, Amores perros (2000, Dir. Alejandro González Iñárritu) and Y tu mamá también (2001, Dir. Alfonso Cuarón) did not count on IMCINE as a producing partner,

[66] Translated from original Spanish.

nor did they participate in the Muestra. In 2001, Mexico was still in the midst of a financial crisis, and so was the film industry, but there was cause for celebration both because production numbers were relatively higher, and because some had achieved success internationally, including the aforementioned Amores perros and Y tu mamá también. While not the primary focus for the moment of this chapter, the previous paragraphs' essentially uncritical historical review should be acknowledged for a moment. At the same time as the Coordinator/Director position changed over the years, arguably the top leadership did not. Holding various titles, Raúl Padillo López has sat at the forefront of the organization from the beginning to the time of this writing. At Padillo López' side, Emilio García Riera served as collaborator from the founding of the Muestra until he passed away in 2002. The organization of the Patronato and the tight collaboration with Televicine, and then IMCINE from the mid 1990s on, served to reinforce in some parts of the film community that the Muestra was and would continue to be the project of an exclusive circle.

The Muestra in 2001 celebrated its sixteenth year, and in an article published in the Mural of Guadalajara on that edition's opening day, Héctor Contreras reflected on the festival's purpose and relevance. In brief, he addressed some of the concerns raised by film critics and scholars that pointed to the insularity of the Muestra's organizing committee at times during its history, and on the negative effects of perceived favoritism with respect to the film selections and guest lists. Contreras' article balanced this view with the perspective of those like David Ramón and Graciela Rodríguez Fierro, who argued essentially that despite obvious shortcomings, the festival overall had met its goal of providing a outlet for Mexican cinema to be seen. A couple others, including Rafael Aviña, pointed to the work that Aguiñaga and Vaidovits, had undertaken to break of out of the insularity of the Guadalajara environs during their tenures; the former ran one of

the most open and inclusive Muestras, and the latter introduced a proposal to take some of the Muestra's selections to other parts of the country ("Da su primer paso"). In any case, while not a central focus here, the politics of selection by the festival coordinators that also results in exclusions, should not be forgotten in the grander scheme of celebrating the accomplishments of the Muestra.

Despite some controversy and a recognition that Mexican cinema was still struggling to rebound, the 2001 Muestra was in many respects a strong year. The selection and programs featured: ten Mexican feature films and seventeen Mexican short films in Official Selection; a published book of photos of the renowned Mexican actor María Félix, and a retrospective of ten films comprising her tribute; an eleven-film retrospective of Spanish filmmaker Fernando Trueba's work; a ten-film selection of Ibero-American Cinema; five feature films, six short films, and sixteen curated videos from the "Invited Country" Germany; additional selections of national and international videos; and six special screenings of international films, including the opening night's Ein Lied von Liebe und Tod (Gloomy Sunday, 1999, Dir. Rolf Schübel) from Germany, and closing night's Before Night Falls (2000, Dir. Julian Schnabel) from the US (XX años 166-67, 219-20). Other figures showed some impressive festival growth. For example, the newspaper El Norte reported that for that year, twenty-nine directors, thirty-eight actors, fifteen critics, and fourteen distributors and producers were in attendance. Additionally, it was well attended: a reported 40,000 were in attendance at the festival, and media coverage included 350 outlets ("Gusta"). That coverage included international attention, for example, Adam Minns of ScreenDaily wrote a brief article, noting major films and awards. His final paragraph opened with "This year's festival appears to have confirmed theevent's [sic] pivotal role as a local and international launch pad for

Mexican films," and closed noting that selections from the festival were going on to presentations in New York, Barcelona, and Rio de Janeiro.

By 2001, the Muestra in Guadalajara was no longer the only annual film festival in the country, as Expresión en Corto held its third edition that July; EEC had not yet reached the stature of the Muestra, but it had been founded in part in response to some of the aforementioned critiques of the festival in Guadalajara. From her perspective in Guanajuato, Sarah Hoch believed the Muestra represented another form of "closed film society" in the 1990s, where their coordinating board and IMCINE were not receptive to films that were not produced by IMCINE, and she worked to establish EEC as more inclusive and representative (Hoch Interview 2013). Despite the two festivals' differences in age, and the fact that EEC was most focused at the time on short films and documentary films, by 2001 they were both significant forums for screenings of contemporary and retrospective Mexican film selections in the country, as well as for panels and debates about the state of the Mexican film industry at the time. In the early 2000s, they would each become leaders in their own way in adding specific Industry initiatives to their programs. With respect to the Muestra, another round of substantive changes were in store for the organization, beginning in 2002, under a new director.

From "Muestra" to "Industry" Leader

The transition between directors of the Muestra leading in to the 17th edition was even more tumultuous than these types of changes typically are. Enrique Ortiga was initially appointed in 2001, but in January of 2002, in agreement with Padilla López and citing his commitments with Titán Producciones, Ortiga stepped down as Director. He moved into an advisory position, and Kenya Márquez Alkadef, who had been serving as Subdirector, was appointed as Director of the Muestra. In an interview, Ortiga pointed to

the festival's return to its origins in a way, in that like Jaime Humberto Hermosillo and unlike the other festival directors, Márquez identified first and foremost as a filmmaker (Contreras, "Asume Kenia [sic] Márquez"). Under Márquez' tenure from 2002-2005, the Muestra would go through a series of transformations that would see it through to its name change to the Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara (FICG) and lay the foundations for the growth of its Industry initiatives.

From the 2002 through the 2005 edition, Márquez worked along with the Board of the Foundation to bring to fruition some major changes that she and/or they wanted to implement. From the very first year that Márquez served as Director, attempts to address some of the Muestra's perceived weaknesses were evident, with an eye on raising the national and international profile of the event. Her mandates were to implement what now may seem like basic festival protocol as far as the film program was concerned: holding an open call for entries for festival submissions; coordinating an official selection committee to review films; and amplifying and making more official an Ibero-American selection, including awards for these parallel sections (Márquez Interview). Among other things, these initiatives were aimed at changing the protocols of the Muestra which had, just the year before, resulted in some glaring absences in the lineup, including Ripstein's Así es la vida (2000) and La perdición de los hombres (The Ruination of Men, 2000), Hermosillo's Escrito en el cuerpo de la noche (Written on the Body of the Night, 2001), and the above-noted Amores perros (XX años 171).

The film program was ambitious on every level in 2002, the 17th edition of the Muestra. For the first time, in addition to the honorific prizes, festival records note cash awards offered to the top Mexican feature and short films ($150,000 MXP and $100,000 MXP respectively), as well as to the winning Ibero-American feature and short in their categories ($100,000 MXP and $50,000 MXP respectively). Additionally twice as many

films screened during the festival as had screened the year before (XX años 171). Official records point to the Muestra in 2002 being a year in which the documentary form took center stage, pointing to the fact that the jury honored the documentary Gabriel Orozco (2002) with Best Film, and awarded its director, writer, and producer Juan Carlos Martín with Best Director accolade (173). In addition to focusing on Márquez as the new Director, the press in Guadalajara pointed to two items of special note regarding programming: the first being that the 2002 Muestra short film selection was much larger than usual, in part because Márquez was drawn to that form. The second was over the evolving nature of the Muestra itself, and what its evolving identity meant. Márquez is quoted as saying:

> It is a showcase [muestra] and a festival; showcase because you will see all of Mexican cinema, and festival because the inclusion of this term opens up stronger opportunities for promotion of Mexican cinema, both terms are viable... I don't know if the name will change... I don't know. (González, "Busca")[67]

The Muestra/Festival would straddle this question for a few years. The name for the 2001 edition of the festival was the "Muestra de Cine Mexicano en Guadalajara Film Fest." In 2002 and 2003, "Muestra de Cine Mexicano en Guadalajara International Film Festival." In 2004, "Cine Mexicano e Iberoamericano Guadalajara Filmfest." As noted previously, the name of "Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara International Film Festival" (FICG) did not appear in full until 2005.

To return to 2002, the program included its traditional offerings, such as holding a retrospective (of work by the Basque filmmaker Montxo Armendáriz), a tribute (of films that featured sound effects by Gonzalo Gavira), and a showcase from Switzerland as invited country of honor. It also included retrospective of 33 Mexican short films from the 1990s and a curated program of film on video (XX años 220-22). New Muestra

[67] Translated from original Spanish.

awards were included to honor the Best Film and Best Director, as well as an Honorable Mention for films in the Ibero-American Features section. Parallel activities during the 17th Muestra included events such as a showing of a collection of Mexican movie posters, an exhibit on painting and cinema by artists from Jalisco, book presentations, and a international meeting entitled "Mujeres y Cine en América Latina" / "Women and Film in Latin America" aimed at bringing together multiple generations of women filmmakers and highlighting the value of their work (177).

The following year, Márquez' second as Director, was marked by both sadness and celebration; Emilio García Riera passed away in October of 2002, and during the Muestra in 2003 he was recognized with a special Mayahuel,[68] and the UDG honored him with a Doctorate Honoris Causa. Amongst the year's book presentations, two were in his honor, reflecting on his life and work (181). The 18th (in 2003) and 19th (in 2004) Muestras maintained and solidified shifts that had begun in 2002, with an eye towards situating the event as a "AA" festival on the world stage, that is, as one of the major film festivals, just below the top tier of festivals like Berlin and Cannes (Ciuk). Critics were not reserved in their critiques of 2002 and 2003, for example, historian and author Perla Ciuk wrote in 2003, "The Muestra finds itself at a crucial point in its transformation and expansion, a process that has provoked the neglect of the soul of this event, Mexican cinema" even as she recognized that Mexican cinema at the time was really in a state of crisis itself.[69] The film selections in and out of competition, official partnerships, and new

[68] The "Mayahuel" is the name of FICG's top awards, and also what became its identifying brand logo, with trophies and logos in the shape of a maguey plant. In the logo, the maguey's leaves' edges are perforated as if made of film strips. Mayahuel is also the Náhuatl name for a goddess, who over time was celebrated as the goddess of the maguey plant and, to some people's dismay, especially scholars, also of the agaves for mezcal and tequila (Valenzuela Zapata and Gaytan). That said, it is an image and legend very much associated with Guadalajara and its state of Jalisco, as it is the hub of agave cultivation in the country.

[69] Translated from original Spanish.

events during the institutional transformations mark a fairly clear "before" and "after" stages, as the organization reimagined itself from "Muestra" to FICG. The Muestra that had been founded to be the premier forum for Mexican cinema would become the FICG, where Mexican films and filmmakers would share a good deal of the spotlight and eventually awards with international invitees.

The 2003 and 2004 film programs were ambitious if uneven in their moves to position the festival as a leader in the presentation of auteur-driven art cinema, from the Ibero-American world and other regions. The selections cut a broad swath across genre, country of origin, and production quality. The latter was especially noted in the Mexican competition, and reflective of the fact that production of feature films in Mexico in the early 2000s. Márquez' quote that opens this chapter points to the acknowledgement of the festival organizers that expansion outside of Mexican films into official competition categories for Ibero-American selections was, in part, a strategy to weather the ups and downs in national output. However, this calculation also goes hand in hand with other efforts to maintain and expand the Muestra's profile in the film festival community and on the international stage. For example, starting in 2003, the Fédération Internationale de la Presse Cinématographique (the International Federation of Film Critics, or FIPRESCI) began including the Muestra among the festivals for which it offered a Critics' Prize (XX años 181). For the first time in 2004, the Mexican businessman Jorge Vergara put forth a prize of $500,000 MXP under the name "Premio JVC" which was intended to fund the winning director's subsequent project. Unfortunately, after a few years, with no film proposals from the award winners on his desk to fund, Vergara decided to stop offering the award (Huerta, "Se retira").

National and international guests of high profile abounded, including Pedro Armendáriz Jr. and Alex de la Iglesia in 2003, and Paolo Taviani, Fernanda Montenegro,

Laia Marull, and Brigitte Broch in 2004 (XX años 183-99). News coverage prior to the 19th Muestra in 2004 boasted that sixteen film critics would be in attendance, and 60 actors, including Diego Yazpik, Diego Luna, and Ana Claudia Talancón ("Quince películas"). Film programs represented varied local to world productions. It is illustrative to consider where the festival was in 2004, as that was just prior to its 20th edition/rebirth as FICG in 2005. The Muestra opened with The Dreamers (2003) by the Italian auteur Bernardo Bertolucci, and closed with O Outro Lado da Rua (The Other Side of the Street, 2004), the directorial debut by Marcos Bernstein, writer of many acclaimed films including Central do Brasil (Central Station, 1998, Dir. Walter Salles). In addition to Bertolucci's film, the 19th Muestra included a number of programs dedicated to Italian cinema: a retrospective of films under the umbrella of Invited Country of Honor; an honorary Silver Mayahuel tribute for collaborative brothers and filmmakers Paolo and Vittorio Taviani, with Paolo in attendance for honors and screenings; and another Silver Mayahuel honor went to the Italian-born Vittorio Storaro, whose presence caused a flurry of press, and whose internationally acclaimed cinematography was showcased in screenings of films Apocalypse Now (Redux) (1979/2001, Dir. Francis Ford Coppola) and The Last Emperor (1987, Dir. Bernardo Bertolucci) as two of the five-part program (XX años 226; "Quince películas").

Other sections of note in 2004 included a retrospective and tribute to the celebrated Mexican actor Ana Ofelia Murguía, a "Memoria recobrada / Recovered Memory" section featuring Nosferatu (1922, Dir. F. W. Murnau) and Los olvidados (1950, Dir. Luis Buñuel), an International section called "Puntos cardinales" / "Cardinal Points," and a program named "Sección infantil" which included films for children (XX años 227). The last two have remained important sections of the program since they were launched in 2003, although they have changed names in the past few years (as of the time

of this writing). As an indication of the ambition of the organizing committee, festival records from the 19th Muestra indicate that 146 films screened from 26 countries, in a total of 10 theaters. Almost 300 invited guests were registered, out of which 41 were film directors, and records indicate 65,000 attendees across the Muestra's events. The Muestra also reports an operating budget just shy of $1.5 million USD. Parallel activities to the festival included the usual types of events including an exposition of large-format photos from Mexican Golden Age films, and something new, a seminar called "Un mundo de cine / A World of Cinema." This seminar united 27 invited film business guests as speakers, with an audience comprised of film students, film enthusiasts, and filmmakers (XX años 193, 199).

This latter activity is of interest here for a couple major reasons. The first is because it explicitly addressed the changing scope of the Muestra as it grew; the 19th Muestra was arguably quite different from the entity as it had been founded in 1986, when major names and audience members could basically spend the duration of the festival in intimate settings, encouraging exchanges between the two. The seminar provided a space where this could happen in 2004 (XX años 193). The second reason is related to the first, in that the Muestra was growing in a very specific manner: incorporation of activities, parallel to the festival's film programs, that eventually would be brought together under an "Industry" umbrella. In 2003, the Muestra held the first Mercado de Cine Iberoamericano en Guadalajara / Guadalajara Film Market, and by 2004 it was gaining attention on the international radar. Before detailing the history of the Mercado and related activities that fall under the "behind the screens" distinction, it is important to first wrap up the final phase of the evolution of the festival's "front of house," at least as it pertains to the studies here.

The final years for discussion start in 2005, when the FICG formally took on that identity as it celebrated the 20th anniversary of the first Muestra de Cine Mexicano en Guadalajara. In anticipation, Padilla López wrote:

> Consistent with the idea behind its origins, the now Guadalajara International Film Festival brings with it the dual strategies of projection and stimulus of national cinema. Equally it seeks full consolidation as a stage for meetings and exchanges between producers, distributors, directors, actors, and exhibitors from both sides of the Atlantic. ("Consolidando" 204)[70]

In the same essay, his words expressed both optimism in the quality and talent of Ibero-American filmmakers, and the recognition that language continued to be a real barrier in the industry in terms of international participation of projects and guests (204). Language barrier aside, press during the time period leading up to and for the festival pointed to the ways that FICG was building its international reputation as a major player on the Ibero-American film circuit.

It certainly helped that of one the nine Mexican films that competed for Best Picture at the 19th Muestra in 2004 was Fernando Eimbeke's first feature, Temporada de patos (Duck Season, 2004). It burst onto the scene, winning eight awards including Best Film, Best Director, Best Script, the Premio JVC, and sharing the Fipresci Award with the film Te doy mis ojos (Take My Eyes, 2003, Dir. Icíar Bollaín). Temporada went on to screen at Cannes, win the Grand Jury Prize at AFI Fest, and be nominated for twelve Mexican Ariel Awards, winning 11 of them, amongst other screenings and accolades around the world (de la Fuente, "At 20"; "Duck Season"). The film also enjoyed limited theatrical distribution including in Mexico, the US, and Argentina. The buzz from the 2004 Muestra was still fresh in the minds of many journalists as they covered FICG in 2005. Comparisons between the two years were also to be expected as the name change

[70] Translated from original Spanish.

and other festival modifications accompanying that change were in the limelight, and festival leadership highlighted in interviews their steadfast commitment of situating FICG as a must-attend event in the Ibero-American cinema circuit.

The 20th Festival in Guadalajara opened with John Waters' A Dirty Shame (2004), for the first time holding that and other screenings in the Teatro Diana, a 2,500 seat theater that was refurbished for that year (de la Fuente, "At 20"). There were other signs of the festival's growth. Its prize amounts more than doubled from 2004 to 2005, to a total of $2.4 million MXP for winners, with the primary award going to the overall Ibero-American winning feature. The Ibero-American competition began to include Mexican films, such that Mexican films were represented in competition both for the top prize as well as under the traditional Mexican Feature and Shorts categories. This competition restructuring was in line with Márquez' and Padilla's reported strategies to use the prestige of the overall lineup and competition sections to attract more international guests. The goal was that guests would attend to view not only the Ibero-American and other global film selections, but also the Mexican, and that perception of the overall quality of the program would reflect well on Mexico and its cinema ("Guadalajara Aiming"; Aréchiga, "Mexicanos a la baja"). This seems to have been successful to at least some extent as evidenced by a post-festival article in the Guadalajara Mural, which cited leading international film festival directors' desire to see more Mexican cinema at FICG. Those interviewed included Rodrigo Díaz, originally from Chile and Director of the Trieste Latin American Film Festival in Italy, and André Paquet, an expert in Latin American film and then programmer for Montreal Film Festival. They recognized that Mexican cinema production at a national level was relatively low, but also that especially considering this, when they traveled to Guadalajara, they hoped to be able to see all of the films produced in the previous year (Aréchiga, "Más cine mexicano").

In any case, FICG in 2005 screened 217 films in total, 90 features and 120 short and mid-length. Two of the five festival tributes were for Mexican filmmakers, namely the celebrated director Jorge Fons, and accomplished production designer and set director Alejandro Luna. The other tributes were international, in particular U.S. filmmaker and cult icon John Waters, the African director Idrissa Ouedrago, and a posthumous celebration of the life and work of prolific French cinéaste Jean Rouch. Mexican films accounted for less than 30% of the offerings at only 61 out of the total 217 films: six Mexican feature narratives, five documentaries, and 34 short films were in competition; four features and twelve shorts screened in non-competitive sections (Aréchiga, "Mexicanos a la baja"; "Más cine mexicano"). That said, Mexico was still very much in the limelight at awards time. Two of the Mexican features in competition overlapped as part of the Ibero-American Competition lineup, El Mago (The Magician, 2004, Dir. Jaime Aparicio) and Noticias lejanas (News from Afar, 2005, Dir. Ricardo Benet). El Mago took home the Mayahueles for Best Mexican Feature, Best Actress, and Best Actor, and Noticias lejanas nabbed the Mayahuel for Best Director. The winner of the overall Ibero-American Mayahuel for Best Film went to an Ecuador-Mexico coproduction, Crónicas (Chronicles, 2004, Dir. Sebastián Cordero). Crónicas starred John Leguizamo and Damián Alcázar, and was also awarded a Mayahuel for Best Screenplay as well as a Best Actor award for Alcázar ("Chronicles"; "'Mago,' 'Cronicas'").

The momentum in 2005 in terms of raising the international profile through growing the film program, expanding the prize portfolios, and focusing on star power, went hand in hand with the other major changes explicitly aimed at attracting members of the film industry to conduct business with each other during the FICG. As noted above, the Ibero-American Market was launched in 2003; in 2005, FICG inaugurated the Encuentro de Coproducción. More than any other aspect of the festival, growing these

two areas—the Market and the Encuentro—and more under the umbrella of "Industry" would become the primary focus of innovation under the leadership of Jorge Sánchez Sosa (Director of FICG, 2006-2010) and then Iván Trujillo (Director, 2011+). The front-of-house engagement with the audience was still important, including the festival's efforts to sustain buzz about FICG as the place to go in the Americas for Ibero-American cinema. In closing this section before focusing next on Industry, it is important to summarily characterize FICG's trajectory as an international film festival from 2006 into subsequent years.

Under festival directors Sánchez and Trujillo, FICG continued to attract attention in world-wide media and industry trade publications, most notably regular coverage by Variety for both the film festival and the market sides of the event. IMCINE in coordination with the UDG and the festival Foundation have remained the major organizing entities of the annual FICG to the time of this writing. Since taking on the new brand and official mantle of Ibero-American film festival as the "Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara," the screening lineup has largely mirrored the early 2000s, with the added bonus that Mexican film production was on the rebound by 2005/2006 (refer to Table 1 in Introduction), allowing for the possibility of a greater selection of national projects in the overall lineup. Through the primary years of this section's focus, competitions and selections reflected the traditional Mexican categories, Ibero-American categories, and international parallel sections (the latter covering individual tributes, for example, or films from guest countries of honor, or panoramas of contemporary film).

The bulk of the rest of this chapter, in terms of its selected film case studies and the highlighted Encuentro years, is primarily concerned with FICG as directed by Márquez and Sánchez; Trujillo took over for the 26th FICG which was held in 2011. Therefore a quick overview of the 2010 catalog's introductions and film program, for the

25th FICG and the last year of Sánchez' tenure as director, provides a sense of the festival's trajectory while he was in that position. Introductory remarks opened with a note from Padilla López as President of the FICG Foundation, followed by Marina Stavenhagen as Director of IMCINE, then the local governor and mayors of the region, then the Rector of the UDG, and closed with a message from Sánchez. Many of the comments pointed to the ways that the FICG aspired to be a meeting place for film enthusiasts and a promoter of diversity in film arts and culture, while acknowledging that it had been a challenge from its origins to meet those aspirations. It is also interesting how many of the remarks centered on ways the festival aimed to situate Mexico and Mexican cinema as influential on the world stage. For example, Stavenhagen wrote that the festival, once the "Mexican Film Exhibition" but now international, was a "needed showcase, a necessary stop along the road that everyone should become acquainted with to approach the Mexican movie industry" (FICG, FICG25 Catalog 31). She later calls the festival "an essential window for our creative expression in movies, an opportunity to know and be known" (31).

For his part, Sánchez aimed to position the festival as an antidote to the commercial nature of the box office, where only a few types of films—dominated by Hollywood fare—were being promoted. He pointed to the festival's origins where the founders "came up with the idea that the Mexican movie industry, characterized by stories with the personality and style of their authors, needed a space to be seen" (FICG, FICG25 Catalog 41). Sánchez believed that, 25 years later, audiences were still not being served by what was in the theaters: "There are many kinds of audiences. There are many kinds of Mexican movies and increasingly more are popping up. I don't have the slightest doubt that there is room for all... or that there should be. Because truth be told, right now there is not" (41). His proposal: that the festival be the site of change, by not

underestimating the public and doing everything possible to engage them actively "to consume other films and to enjoy watching them" (42). Essentially, Sánchez proposed that if the public could be given the means and incentive to seek out diverse films, forming an alliance in support of creative work, perhaps more diverse films would make it to the screens. In this view, the festival would provide a site where the public and creative talent could meet, carving out a space for them to sustain each other, in counter to mass consumer culture. Specifically he wanted distributors to be challenged to change their ways (41-42). Quite optimistic, and reflective of an idealism in the arts sector that has not to date translated well into commerce—the notion that a festival can intervene in consumer culture by generating a public that will then seek out art cinema at the box office was not new, but even in the US independent sector which is better funded than Mexico against Hollywood distributors and exhibitors, this has historically been difficult for many filmmakers to achieve. However, Sánchez' introductory comments were committed to the proposal, and, as we shall see in the next section of this chapter, Sánchez and team would move the festival further towards explicitly intervening in the film industry.

In terms of the film screening lineup, at FICG25 it reflected traditions and adjustments building over the years; as in previous years, the festival featured tributes, retrospectives, and a number of sections devoted to celebrating the guest country, France. Over 250 films screened in a variety of categories, and three items deserve comment before moving on, as they took place under Sánchez' tenure. First, leading up to and reflected by 2010's program, FICG had established a wider set of categories for both Ibero-American and Mexican film "Official Sections." There were competition sections for Ibero-American Fiction Feature, Mexican Fiction Feature, Ibero-American Documentary Feature, Mexican Documentary Feature, Ibero-American Short Film,

Mexican Short Film, and Mexican Short Animation. This last was an interesting addition, especially as it did not have a corresponding Ibero-American category. The Official Sections were rounded out by Ibero-American Film and Mexican Film "Out of Competition" selections. Second, the 25th FICG marked the third year the festival organized a Mezcal Jury comprised of Mexican youths to select their favorite Mexican fiction film in selection. Although the criteria for jury selection would change under Trujillo, under Sánchez' direction a large group was selected each year; in 2010, 50 young adults between the ages of 18 and 25 served as the jury, chosen based on a film review they submitted about a Mexican film (FICG, FICG25 Catalog 55). According to festival documents, "In the beginning, the Mezcal Jury's purpose was to become aware of the cinematic taste of Mexican youth, and introduce them to the world of movies" (Catálogo del FICG26 53), which resonates with many of the organizers' beliefs, for example Sánchez' noted above, about a driving purpose of the festival being the engagement of Mexican audiences with Mexican films.

The third and final item for this discussion is also centered around engaging the community with festival films. The festival had introduced film Galas as part of the program leading up to FICG25 in 2010, where the events featured premieres of national and international films, usually with red carpets and stars in attendance. In FICG25, the Galas were promoted as charity events, with box office receipts collected for local charities (Catálogo del FICG26 248; "Entregó el FICG"). For example, the film El secreto de sus ojos (The Secret in Their Eyes, 2009, Dir. Juan José Campanella) raised funds for Operation Smile México, a non-profit helping people with facial malformations to connect with surgeons, and the film Lula, o Filho do Brasil (Lula, the Son of Brazil, 2009, Dir. Fabio Barreto) benefitted Fundación Voluntarios Contra el Cáncer, an organization helping youth and adults with cancer to find and pay for care. According to

La Jornada Michoacán, 2010 marked the second year that FICG had raised funds through Galas for charity, during which they raised $82,000 MXP ("Entregó el FICG").

These modifications in "front of house" programming, which point to efforts by festival leadership to maintain and foster connections between FICG programs, local constituencies, and Mexican audiences, especially youth/young adult, ran in parallel to the built-in foundational partnership between FICG and the UDG; the University's resources including facilities, staff, and students, had remained integral to the operations of and attendance at the festival from the beginning. Most of the rest of the festival's innovations, especially since 2003, took place in another area through other activities, aimed overtly at connecting the festival outward and attracting international guests to Guadalajara in support of Mexican and Ibero-American cinema.

MEXICO'S IBERO-AMERICAN FILM MARKET, THE ENCUENTRO DE COPRODUCCIÓN, AND LEADER IN INDUSTRY

As discussed previously, the early to mid 2000s were a time of great change within the Muestra de Cine Mexicano, as over a few years the organization transformed into the FICG. As leadership navigated downturns in Mexican cinema production, as well as concerns about how best to sustain the organization as a vital cultural entity, they planted the seeds for the identity of the FICG as it exists at the time of this writing. Changes to the content and organization of the film festival program sections and awards took the festival in the direction of balancing its support for Mexican cinema and filmmakers, with the broader goal of allying forces with other Latin American and Iberian cinemas and cineastes. In addition to adjusting the film program, festival organizers sought other means of attracting international talent to Guadalajara, and attempting to leverage this towards advancing Mexican filmmakers' work on the world stage.

In 2005, the festival that started out as the Mexican Film Showcase found itself going into its 20th edition with only six narrative feature films in its Official Mexican Section. Speaking to the press, Márquez addressed this in the context of the state of the Mexican industry, as well is with respect to the official name change of the Muestra to the FICG. After acknowledging that the festival's program was dependent on the number of Mexican films produced annually, she added, "I feel that one way or another, the outlook for Mexican film will be more favorable now with this relaunch. That when a spectator views more Ibero-American cinema, and Hispanic language cinema, things can only get better for Mexican cinema" (Aréchiga, "Mexicanos a la baja").[71] In addition to the usual coverage of film screenings and stars in attendance, news outlets in 2005 also followed closely what had become the other major innovation of the Guadalajara festival: the Mercado de Cine Iberoamericano en Guadalajara (the Guadalajara Film Market) which was first organized in 2003. In addition to the Mercado, the FICG in 2005 held the first Encuentro de Co-Producción (Ibero-American Coproduction Meeting). The Mercado and the Encuentro were the first two initiatives in Guadalajara in an area of parallel coordination, and they along with a host of others would eventually constitute "Industria / Industry" at FICG.

In a 2013 interview, Márquez spoke about the origins of these initiatives. When she came on board as Director in 2002, two major questions were being contemplated by the Foundation, especially with respect to the future of the Muestra and any impact it could have in these areas: (1) How to help promote increased distribution and exhibition of Mexican and other Spanish-language films?; (2) How to reinvigorate Mexican and Ibero-American film industries so that more films would be produced, sustaining the

[71] Translated from original Spanish.

Muestra but also providing for more possibilities for filmmakers from these regions? The debate was whether to start with a film market for finished films (to address question 1), or to start with an initiative that would bring together films in pre-production with possible producing partners (to address question 2). Márquez recalled,

> And we spoke about creating a Market, and creating a Coproduction Meeting. The President of the Foundation was more for the Market, and I was more in favor of the Coproduction Meeting because I was a director and I had only made short films; I understood that this was what filmmakers needed most. (Márquez Interview)[72]

In the end, the Mercado / Market was the first of the two to get off the ground. In preparation, the Muestra leadership looked towards international festivals; Márquez cited the Festival de Cine Iberoamericano de Huelva in Spain (the Huelva Ibero-American Film Festival), and the Festival Internacional de Cine de Mar del Plata in Argentina (the Mar del Plata International Film Festival) as inspirations, as they were festivals roughly in Guadalajara's league. She recalled that they decided to contact buyers and sellers who specialized in Ibero-American films, and with this in mind, they began to make lists. The lists were detailed, including information beyond just names and companies, but also facts like how many films each company bought per year as well as what types of deals they cut with the people whose films they bought. Márquez estimated they came up with a list of about 150 from all over the world, and they set about trying to entice them to come to Guadalajara. Convincing them to add the Muestra to their circuit was a challenge, as many had full schedules year-round. Film industry buyers in the festival and art cinema circuit, especially before the internet permitted online streaming of movies, relied on festival screenings and markets in order to view films. Their travel could take them to the Sundance Film Festival in January, the International Film Festival Rotterdam

[72] Translated from original Spanish.

and associated CineMart in late January / early February, the Berlin International Film Festival (Berlinale) and associated European Film Market in February, the Cannes Film Festival and associated Marché du Film in May, to just name some of the big ones on the spring cycle. These buyers are on tight budgets and do not travel unless either their expenses are covered by invitation, or the outlay is worth the gamble because—based on the experience and reputation of a festival or market—they are likely to find good films to buy that could recoup on investment. One of the major expenses the Muestra had to account for, in order to attract distributors and exhibitors to the Mercado, was to pay for a good number of attendees' flights and hotel (Márquez Interview).

The first year, 2003, Laura Ruiz headed up the Mercado. Ruiz came on board with more than two decades of experience in marketing and distributing Ibero-American films. In an interview during the lead-up to the Mercado, Ruiz discussed the unique nature of the Muestra's market, where, because it specialized in Ibero-American films, buyers and sellers would not have to wade through the market's international offerings to find films from the niche they were looking for, like they had to do in other markets including Berlin or Cannes (González, "Afinan"). The first Mercado was held in the gardens of the Hotel Camino Real, with a setup for viewing on VHS approximately 250 titles from the early 2000s, where the more than 120 buyers and sellers they expected would be able to view the titles they were interested in. Additionally some of the films were screened at one of the partnering cinemas (González, "Afinan"). For the Mercado's second year, Alejandra Paulín stepped in to the Market Director position. Records indicate that 170 invited guests, representing buyers, sellers, and distributors, had the opportunity to view more than 300 titles (XX años 193; Aréchiga, "Visitan"). By the third Mercado in 2005, Paulín reported that 380 titles were available ("Visitan"); 160 attendees were registered for the market, leading up to the event ("Mexicanos a la baja").

Also in 2005, Márquez finally saw the realization of the Encuentro de Co-Producción (Ibero-American Coproduction Meeting) that she had been lobbying for. She found more support for implementing the idea once the Mercado had established that industry representatives would attend the festival for activities parallel to the official screenings, which were specifically targeted to bolstering industry business (Márquez Interview). At the same time, IMCINE was invested in supporting initiatives like the Encuentro as part of its multi-pronged efforts to inject some life into the Mexican film industry. In the early to mid 2000s, major funds administered by IMCINE included (1) the Fondo de Inversión y Estímulos al Cine (Fund for Film Investment and Stimulation, or FIDECINE); (2) the Fondo para la Producción Cinematográfica de Calidad (Fund for the Production of Quality Films, or FOPROCINE); and (3) the Estímulo Fiscal a la Producción Cinematográfica Nacional (Financial Stimulus for National Cinematic Production, or EFICINE). However, IMCINE representatives recognized that work still needed to be done, to connect film projects with potential coproducers and other investors. In an interview, Víctor Ugalde, who was Technical Director of FIDECINE from 2002-2009 and an architect of EFICINE, described IMCINE's interest in the Mercado and in developing a platform for meetings:

> When Guadalajara started with the Industry area, this coincided with [IMCINE's] initiatives and funds. [...] At the time, Mexican distributors did not take calls from Mexican filmmakers. There weren't many distributors, maybe thirty, but in order to try to see them all, to see if they were interested in your film, you could spend a year visiting them. But if we held a market, there we could invite everyone, sit them down at a pitch, and in one week you take care of one year of work. (Ugalde Interview)[73]

Ugalde then explained that they spoke with Guadalajara about "pitching" style meetings and also with EEC in Guanajuato, and the first one to get it going was EEC. Additionally,

[73] Translated from original Spanish.

he astutely observed, "as festivals copy other festivals, once Guanajuato was out of the gate, the next edition of Guadalajara included pitches" (Ugalde Interview).[74] The pitches at FICG formed one of the activities of the first Encuentro; this event took place in March of 2005, less than a year after the first International Pitching Market (IPM) had been held in Guanajuato during EEC.

The foundation of the Encuentro shared some similarities with the IPM, namely that the team behind the initiative were interested in concretely spurring an increase in Mexican film production and co-production. Furthermore, they recognized that in order to have any chance of intervening on this level, potential investors (producers, funding agencies, or other potential business partners) had to be enticed to get to know projects, and project presentation would have to rise to the expectation of those investors (A. Stavenhagen Interview; Márquez Interview; FICG, "Informe 2005"). As had EEC, FICG partnered with Mexico's Fund for Film Investment and Stimulation (Fondo de Inversión y Estímulos al Cine, or FIDECINE) as well as the Mexican Writers Guild (Sociedad General de Escritores de México, or SOGEM) for the development of the Encuentro. To get the call for entries out widely, the Encuentro benefitted from the already wide network of press outlets that FICG had cultivated. The event's organizing team also received support from IMCINE through a paid insert in the Reforma newspaper that ran in December of 2004, and advice and logistical support through Patricia Martin of Projeto Pro@rte / Project ProArte, who was instrumental in widely circulating the call and tracking potential Ibero-American projects (FICG, "Informe 2005").

Andrea Stavenhagen was hired in mid-January 2005 as Executive Coordinator of the Encuentro, and she remained an integral part of leadership at the FICG in various

[74] Translated from original Spanish.

roles through the 2013 FICG Industry events. Notably, and in distinction from the IPM in Guanajuato, from the beginning, the Encuentro was international in project selection scope. Stavenhagen's reports indicate that the selection committee for the I Encuentro in 2005[75] was comprised of Kenya Márquez on the part of FICG, Víctor Ugalde for FIDECINE, and Rafael Montero for SOGEM. Their selection for the I Encuentro included 10 projects representing Mexico and 10 representing other Ibero-American countries (see Appendix J). Another distinction from the IPM was that the Encuentro was organized to allow for meetings between projects and potential investors, but without the strict agenda of the IPM; every project did not meet with every Encuentro-accredited entity. The I Encuentro opened with presentations by the culturally-oriented funding entities FIDECINE (Mexico), Hubert Bals (The Netherlands), Fonds Sud (France), Programa Ibermedia (Spain), and the Program for Media Artists (USA). These were followed by open pitches by project representatives, forum style, where each project was provided twenty minutes to speak in front of the group of attendees. After all the pitches, which wrapped in early afternoon of the second day, there was open time for meetings which could be held in the market area or elsewhere (FICG, "Informe 2005").

In later years, the open pitch portion of the agenda was eliminated, and the meetings were emphasized, with each selected project being provided a table in a formal Encuentro section of the Mercado. According to wrap report, the projects reviewed attendee lists and requested meetings based on their preferences, and accredited Industry guests reviewed project information prior to the Encuentro, and requested meetings based on their interests. The coordinating team set agendas for both parties based on the overlaps. In theory, this logistical decision would help facilitate more productive

[75] The festival tracks the event with Roman numerals preceding its name, so the first Encuentro in 2005 is written as I Encuentro Iberoamerico de Coproducción Cinematográfico, or I Encuentro for short, the second in 2006 as II Encuentro, and so on.

meetings, within the limited time available for them. Considering that by 2007, the III Encuentro report indicates that there were 45 producers, distributors, and fund representatives accredited, and the number has gone up since then, not every project could realistically have a quality meeting with each of them (FICG, "Informe 2007"). The reality of the film industry is that it is a long shot in many circumstances for projects to be made; the FICG strategy was aimed at increasing the odds of a good match by pre-vetting the meetings. Since its inception to the time of this writing, the Encuentro has maintained a tradition of opening with an introductory presentation or set of presentations. In recent years, they have favored a single informative presentation. For example in 2009, representations of the Hubert Bals Fund (HBF) spoke about "their policies and activities so that young producers and filmmakers know firsthand the ways to apply for a grant or funding" (FICG24 Industry Catalog 253), and in 2011, Katriel Schory was a special guest for the "Israel Film Fund presentation and lecture 'The Benefits and the Downsides of Coproduction'" (FICG26 Agenda Industria 22). Interestingly in 2012, the VIII Encuentro opened with a series of open pitches from a select group from a parallel activity, namely the Talent Campus Guadalajara (FICG27 Agenda Industria 10-11), an initiative we will discuss briefly after wrapping the discussion of the Encuentro.

From the beginning, the Encuentro has included an award structure. For the I Encuentro in 2005, the award was comprised of a package for the winning project. It included: equipment from the UDG; prints and advertising for distribution from Videocine; discounted post services from New Art Digital; discounted rates for film development and color correction from Estudios Churubusco Azteca; discounted film stock from Kodak Mexicana; discounted insurance rates from LCI Seguros Fílmicos. The jury included a representative from each of the above except for LCI, and they chose

Párpados azules (Blue Eyelids) represented by director Ernesto Contreras, as the winner (FICG, "Informe 2005").[76] Over the years the sponsoring companies have fluctuated, and what they have offered in cash awards or services has also changed; however, consistently the award has been substantial and sought after by participating filmmakers (A. Stavenhagen Interview).

Since the Muestra coordinating team launched the Mercado in 2003, the Market and subsequently the umbrella Industry area have expanded substantially in breadth and depth, all with the overarching aim of promoting the production and co-production of films in Mexico and other Ibero-American countries. For example, in 2007, FICG hosted the first Producers Network in Guadalajara within the FICG Industry program; this was established through a partnership with the Marché du Film Festival de Cannes, and is a collaboration which continues through the time of this writing. Registered producers have attended round tables designed around topics; the working sessions have featured moderators with experience in various facets of the film industry, along with invited guests, at each table. By way of illustration, in 2011, one of the moderators was Alfredo Calvino, who has years of experience in international sales and distribution including with the Instituto Cubano del Arte e Industria Cinematográfica (the Cuban Film Institute, or ICAIC) and with Grupo Novo de Cinema e TV in Brazil. At the time, he was Chief Executive of Latinofusión based in Guadalajara, which specialized in distribution and sales for Latin American films. On the first day, at his table, he hosted Márcia Nunes, International Sales and Acquisitions executive from Goldcrest Films of the UK, and on the second day, he hosted Josetxo Moreno and Otilio García, General Managers of Golem Distribution, based in Spain. The official theme for Nunes' participation was

[76] This film would be completed in 2007; Párpados azules and its awards are discussed further in the conclusion of this chapter.

Production and Sales, and for Moreno and García it was Production and Distribution in Spain. Other topics abounded at other tables, across the spectrum of financing through sales and distribution (FICG26 Industry Catalog 334-36).

Another initiative launched in 2007 was Cine en Construcción (Films in Progress) in partnership with Festival de Cine Latinoamericano de Toulouse (Toulouse Latin American Film Festival) and the Festival Internacional de cine de San Sebastián (San Sebastián International Film Festival). The organizations parted ways after that year, and from 2008 on the section has been called Guadalajara Construye.[77] From the beginning this section of Industry has featured a select group of Ibero-American films in post-production seeking financing for completion and/or theatrical distribution of their films.

A number of other activities have since come to comprise the Industria / Industry area of FICG, always with its own sets of events, registrations, spaces, and even a catalog, and all running parallel to the film festival. FICG' Film Festival events and Industry activities are interdependent and often rely on each other for buzz. For instance in 2010, a festival dispatch filed by Howard Feinstein for Indiewire.com, entitled "10 Films to Watch from the Guadalajara Film Festival," devoted over one-third of its introduction to describing the Talent Campus and the Market. FICG special programs and invited guests often cross over to both areas, for example, also with reference to 2010, France as "Guest Country" and Foci en Andalucía (Spotlight on Andalusia) were two of the featured programs in the festival screening lineup. In the schedule of Industria / Industry activities, two of the highlighted events were a Mexico-France Meeting and a Mexico-Andalusia Meeting, in both cases the full title included "Meeting with

[77] The name Guadalajara Construye translates directly as "Guadalajara Constructs" however it is most common to refer to it in English by its Spanish name or as "Films in Progress."

Authorities, Producers, and Distributors" and was by invitation only for representatives from each country or region (FICG25 Industry Catalog 7).

Similar to the interviewed participants from the IPM at EEC/GIFF, filmmakers who attended the Encuentro in its early years expressed understandably high expectations for results from their meetings. Unlike at EEC/GIFF, filmmakers participating in the Encuentro also had the opportunity to win awards, that could help them with their projects even if a deal did not result from meetings. The production histories of Cinco días sin Nora (Nora's Will) and Vaho (Becloud) in this chapter raise points for analysis, with respect to film production in Mexico, and ways that participation in film festival activities such as the Encuentro in Guadalajara have formed a part of that trajectory in these cases. Parallel to the IPM selected films, for these case studies, I also looked for two projects that fit certain parameters. First, I wanted to profile two films, of Mexican origin, that were completed after participating in the Encuentro. In this case I found a project that was helmed by a woman writer/director, and, because Cinco días also worked with other criteria I was considering, I chose to include it in this investigation. The film represented the more classical style of narrative and form of the two case studies in this chapter. Cinco días was funded in part by FIDECINE and EFICINE, indicating that it was deemed to have some commercial potential at least by IMCINE's review committee. It turned out to be true, as the film enjoyed success on the festival circuit, theatrical releases both nationally and internationally, and reached subsequent windows as well. The second selected case study film, Vaho, was exemplary of an art cinema production, narratively and stylistically; it was financed in part by FOPROCINE, the "quality film" branch of IMCINE's major stimulus funds. Vaho's circulation has been primarily on art cinema circuits, especially festivals.

As with the IPM case studies, the filmmakers interviewed about the Encuentro worked through challenges and relied on networks wherever they could to augment their resources and advance their projects. Both projects were personal projects helmed by a writer/director who also ended up as co-producer; both were difficult to finance and complete, but for different reasons. When I began this project and selected films to research more in-depth, I was unsure whether or not any would identify immediate results from participating in their respective festival initiatives. It turned out with the Encuentro case studies that for Cinco días, the answer would be yes, and for Vaho, the answer would be no. Despite these initial differences, in both instances in retrospect, the filmmakers reported ways in which the experiences helped them learn about internal industry workings. This points to value in participation that, like those identified through the IPM case studies, are connected with professional formation and associated long-term benefits. After reviewing the case study histories of each film, this chapter will wrap with some conclusions related to the trajectory of FICG, the Encuentro, and Mexican film production.

Cinco días sin Nora (Nora's Will): Participant in I Encuentro de Coproducción (2005)

In 2005, Cinco días sin Nora (Nora's Will) participated in the first Encuentro de Coproducción (Ibero-American Coproduction Meeting). Twenty projects formed the full selection for the inaugural event, with ten from Mexico and ten from other Latin American countries; Spain was represented as a co-producing country with Chile on one project. Cinco días was a first feature written, directed, and co-produced by Mariana Chenillo. From the beginning, it was a personal story on every level based on Chenillo's grandparents,

> Reedited, reelaborated and reinvented, and well, while my grandmother was alive, I was thinking about how it would be to decide exactly when you are going to die, you could plan everything around you, it would give death different meaning. I thought about it when she was here, and after she died, because she did commit suicide [...] right about when I started school actually.[78]

As this commentary by Chenillo indicates, the story was a challenging one for her to figure out how to tell, and not only because it dealt with a family story, and serious issues like suicide, but in particular she had to figure out the right tone to bring it to life. The completed film, Cinco días, ended up being a family dramatic comedy, a dark comedy at times, that takes place in the days after the death of Nora. A character-driven story, essentially linear and classically narrated with some flashbacks, there are clear stakes and a coherent resolution to close the film. In the film, Nora commits suicide right before Passover. According to Jewish tradition, she cannot be buried for several days; there is also a question of where she may be buried and what aspects of Jewish tradition are to be honored. During the days prior to her burial, Nora's ex-husband, her children and her grandchildren, must face each other and reconcile their pasts.

Chenillo attended the CCC, graduating in 2003. In a recent interview, she recalled that during her time there, for her school projects, she worked on short fictional pieces, all related to the same story, around the themes of death, suicide, grandparents and ancestors. However it was not until after graduating that she was able to find the tone for a feature script, and it was a process of a few years that began with a scholarship for workshops through the Programa Jóvenes Creadores (The Program for Young Artists) through the Fondo Nacional para la Cultural y Artes (The National Fund for Culture and Arts, or FONCA). Chenillo's mentor there was Ignacio Ortiz who had also been one of her professors at the CCC. In her estimation, the first draft was pretty rough, but she was starting to get at the idea. From there Chenillo went to a workshop in Argentina, hosted

[78] Translated from original Spanish.

by the Fundación TyPA (Foundation TyPA; Teoría y Práctica de las Artes / Theory and Practice in the Arts). This is where she felt she had her biggest breakthrough, even though it was neither a script nor a producing workshop. Instead, it was geared at training filmmakers to sell their project, specifically learning how to present their project in brief while highlighting aspects that would engage their audience. In preparing for the workshop, Chenillo worked extensively on a synopsis. The synopsis ended up being key; in an interview in 2013, she credited the workshop with helping her focus on the salient points. The script would evolve substantially from there, taking shape around that synopsis (Chenillo Interview).

Chenillo returned from Argentina invigorated. She had been considering submitting the film to the CCC's program for filming alumni first features, however as it was such a personal project she decided against it. Instead, she applied to the Encuentro de Coproducción (Chenillo Interview). The catalog for the Mercado that year listed 176 accredited industry professionals from twenty-two countries, across the categories of Buyers, Distributors, Exhibitors, Producers, Institutions, Sales, Film Directors, and Festivals (FICG, "Contactos"). Festival records from 2005 identify twenty-three international funding organizations and producers officially invited to the Encuentro. This distinction of accreditation was especially important for the I Encuentro because, as noted previously, that year's schedule of events featured project pitches. Each project was assigned a presentation slot on either March 13th or March 14th, and only persons with Encuentro accreditation or press accreditation were permitted access to these pitches. The Encuentro as well as the Mercado took place in the Galería Room at the main hotel for the festival that year, the Hotel Camino Real (FICG, "Informe 2005").

It turned out that Laura Imperiale was one of the producers in attendance for the pitches. Imperiale is from Argentina originally, but has lived and worked in Mexico since

1979. Until she arrived in Mexico, she had not worked professionally as a producer; instead she had worked on some small projects in Argentina with a non-professional group, then as an assistant editor for a production company in Brazil, then in sound and editing for a company making documentaries in Norway, then landed in Mexico. In Mexico she noticed that, at the time, almost no one was dedicated to the profession of film producer (Imperiale Interview). Correspondingly, while Imperiale started out as an editor, she eventually worked her way into producing, most notably on films directed by Arturo Ripstein, including the aforementioned Así es la vida and La perdición de los hombres. Prior to the I Encuentro, Chenillo had worked script continuity on a film that Imperiale produced, the Diego Luna vehicle Nicotina (Nicotine, 2003, Dir. Hugo Rodríguez), so they were not strangers when they met at FICG (Chenillo Interview).

At the Encuentro, Chenillo was really moved by the experience: "It was the first time I stood in front of an audience as a director and told a story [...]. I realized that [...] I could tell a story, that I had a story that was interesting to the people there" (Chenillo Interview).[79] However, even though many people were interested, they would not come on board as investors because they could not figure out how the film could be packaged, which was difficult for her. Chenillo explained, "From the beginning of seeking financing we experienced a duality, 'We love the film but we don't know how to fund it because we don't know how to classify it'" (Chenillo Interview).[80] She felt they wanted it to fit their ideas of "Latin-American" cinema, "representative of our reality" (even though there is no one Latin-American reality), or for her to be able to reference a film that it was like, or clearly describe the tone or genre, all of which she had trouble with.[81] The

[79] Translated from original Spanish.
[80] Translated from original Spanish.
[81] Translated from original Spanish.

result was that it would take more than two years from that pitch to the time the film would reach audiences, and even through the disillusionment that many doors seemed like they would open that later did not, Chenillo credited the experience at the Encuentro with being a most amazing time, topped only by the premiere of the film in Morelia at the FICM with her family there. Imperiale approached Chenillo in Guadalajara, and from then they worked together to raise the funds for the film (Imperiale Interview).

It took some time to finance the film, even though Chenillo went on to participate in pitching meetings at the prestigious Buenos Aires Lab at the Buenos Aires Festival Internacional de Cine Independiente (Buenos Aires International Independent Film Festival, or BAFICI), and her project was considered seriously by Cinéma d'Arte France, the film ended up being financed in Mexico by FIDECINE and EFICINE funds. Co-produced by Chenillo and Imperiale, through Imperiale's company Cacerola films, Cinco días began a very successful festival and release schedule. Cinco días first screened at FICM in 2008, where it won the Audience Award. The primary architect for the release strategy of the film was Alfredo Calvino of Latinofusión. According to Chenillo, he liked the film and saw that it connected well with audiences, so he decided to be very particular about its festival circuit. Rather than try to get it into particular festivals just to have it screen there out of competition, Calvino favored bookings with festivals which invited the film for competition. At the same time, he developed strategies as sales agent, for national and international distribution across media (Chenillo Interview). Hence the film did not screen in Berlin or Cannes or similarly tiered festivals, but rather at Miami International Film Festival, Cine Las Americas International Film Festival in Austin, TX,[82] and Los Angeles Latino International Film Festival (LALIFF), all in 2009, winning

[82] As noted in the Introduction of this project, I was employed as Film Program Associate for Cine Las Americas International Film Festival (CLAIFF) from the Fall of 2008 to Fall of 2014, and was responsible

Audience Awards at the first two of these, and Jury Awards for Best Director and Best First Film at the latter; this list only scratches the surface of festival awards won.

The film won eight Mexican Ariel Awards and marked the first time a woman won best director. Calvino's strategy of making a number of smaller deals worked out quite well for the film. Theatrical releases included Mexico, Argentina, USA, Spain, South Korea, Germany, Colombia, and Brazil. Pay TV rights included HBO Latino in the US, Globosat Telecine in Brazil, and other premium TV deals were arranged throughout Latino America (Hopewell; Chenillo Interview). DVD releases have included Mexico, USA, Argentina, and Switzerland ("Cinco días") and on their website, Menemsha Films, who secured US Theatrical and DVD rights in 2009, offers DVD sales and lists Netflix as an outlet for the film in the US as of the time of this writing. As its journey reflects, this is a film that has managed to achieve a certain level of popular as well as critical success.

Vaho (Becloud): Participant in III Encuentro de Coproducción (2007)

The second film up for discussion in this chapter is quite distinct in tone and style from Cinco días sin Nora. The film Vaho (Becloud) formed part of the III Encuentro de Coproducción selection in 2007. That year, twenty-two projects participated in the third edition of the Encuentro; of those, four entered as Mexican productions, and three as Mexican co-productions. The remaining fifteen projects represented a number of countries from Latin America, Portugal, and Spain (refer to Appendix L for complete list of selected projects). This, like Cinco días, was also a first feature, by writer/director/co-producer Alejandro Gerber Bicecci. It took a number of years to get off the ground, and Gerber worked a good deal on the script by himself, then brought on Abril Schmucler as co-producer. In most other comparative categories, Vaho differs substantially from Cinco

---

for programming the film Nora's Will in Austin for the 2009 edition of that festival. At the time of this writing, I recently completed one season as Festival Director for CLAIFF.

días. A challenging film formally and narratively, Vaho relies heavily on the viewer to piece together an elliptical story. The story develops around an ensemble cast of characters, and jumps back and forth in time, recalling piece by piece, three boys' memory of a shared traumatic event in their past. As the full scope of the tragedy unfolds in Vaho, transitions are not always clear between scenes or between past and present, and the style throughout is heavily indebted to art cinema.

Both Gerber and Schmucler were students at the CCC, but in classes a few years apart, with Gerber presenting his thesis, the dramatic short Peatonal in 2004, and Schmucler completing her thesis film, the experimental documentary short Los nueve infiernos (Nine Hells) in 2011. Prior to teaming up on Vaho, according to Schmucler, they had known each other through school, working on a CCC production (Schmucler Interview). After graduating in 2004, Gerber decided to work on a script for his first feature. On reflection, he praised the training in cinematography and direction that he had learned at the CCC, but he found himself completely unprepared to write a feature film script. He put together a basic plot in about twenty pages and used that to apply for a screenwriting grant from IMCINE. He was awarded that grant in the fall of 2005, and along with funding, the grant provided for mentoring from screenwriter and filmmaker Marina Stavenhagen. He took advantage of this to produce the first full draft of the screenplay (Gerber Interview).

Meanwhile, Schmucler was studying the direction track, but while found herself interested in learning how to be a producer, the CCC did not offer that track of study at the time. Based on her interest, she decided to apply to Morelia Lab with a script that her father had written. In order to submit the application, she needed to list someone as director, and she asked Gerber if she could use his name, which she did with his permission. In a 2013 interview, she recalled that did really like the project she

submitted, but was not necessarily interested in producing that script at the time. Instead, Schmucler used it as a vehicle to take advantage of the production classes that she could take with Carlos Taibo, whose extensive experience on national and international productions shooting in Mexico was attractive to her to learn from. She attended Morelia Lab in its first edition in 2005, and has credited that experience as key to her confidence that she could be a professional producer; other people were doing it, and the tips she learned and conversations she had convinced her that it was an attainable goal (Schmucler Interview).

Still working on the Vaho script, Gerber applied to a residency program in Buenos Aires at Fundación Proa, an organization that supports contemporary art and artists. He was selected to represent Mexico at the residency, and he went there for four months, and worked with Argentine filmmakers on the script, as well as learning about production. Argentina was producing a good deal more output film-wise than Mexico; Gerber recalled that he took advantage of his time there to learn from working producers. The experience also served to reinforce in Gerber the awareness that his script was a very personal one, and it would be hard to bring a producer on board, especially a financial partner. He concluded he was going to have to make the film for as small a budget as possible. At the same time, he was also still struggling with the script; Gerber felt he had the story in his head, but structuring it on paper was not working clearly for him. Back in Mexico, Gerber got in touch with Schmucler, inviting her to work with him. She was interested and together they committed to bringing the film to life (Gerber Interview).

Leading up to applying to the Encuentro, Gerber and Schmucler received a development grant from IMCINE. They used this along with a camera from the school and some support from Kodak (film stock) and New Art (film development) to shoot some documentary style footage in Xalapa. In a 2013 interview, Gerber stated that

because they could find neither a cinematographer nor a sound person, he shot the footage with Schmucler working sound. They used that work to help supplement their submission materials, to give a sense of the style they would aim for with the film. The two of them applied to the III Encuentro with hopes of finding an investing partner. Not much was in place yet with the film; no firm cast or crew, only ideas of who might work had been discussed (Gerber Interview). When reflecting on the experience, Schmucler mentioned that they had high hopes at the same time, but they did not really know what to expect or if they should expect anything. She pointed to how new they were to this type of event, and that she had the sensation that they should go to the Encuentro and just try to convince everyone to be a part of the project (Schmucler Interview).

They arrived to the Encuentro with the basic but essential need to find a co-producer. In 2007, the Encuentro was held in the Dalia Room of the Fiesta Americana Hotel in Guadalajara. On the first day, a series of presentations by international film funding and incentives agencies formed part of the official events of the Encuentro. Individual meetings between project representatives and potential new partners took place on the second and third days. Each project was assigned a table, and agendas were set individually by the FICG Encuentro coordinating team, for each of the projects and each of the entities interested in meeting with them. Festival records indicate that there were 55 individuals specifically accredited for the Encuentro meetings, and another 37 individuals who had general Market and Festival accreditation, who based on their profile and/or expressed interest in the projects, were invited to meet with project representatives at the Encuentro.

When asked about their experience, both Schmucler and Gerber recalled a hectic schedule, with at least twenty meetings, and described sensations of disillusionment (Schmucler Interview; Gerber Interview). As noted above, Schmucler was prepared to

spread a wide net, and they did as much as they could, both at formal meetings and also at other festival activities. What they discovered was that no one was interested in coming on board with funding. In fact, Schmucler mentioned that many of the people who took meetings with them had even less resources than they did; further, she left with the clear impression that many were not even interested in finding a project but rather were there to be seen at the event (Schmucler Interview). For his part, Gerber candidly stated that he felt many people taking meetings with them were less than sincere about what they were there for, noting that one person they met with was actually looking for actors for his next film and was using meetings to go over other projects' cast lists (Gerber Interview).

Despite these initial impressions, the experience was not all bad. With a few years having passed to reflect on it, Gerber's illuminating analysis was that what made it the most unpleasant was the power differential between the "pitchers" (those with projects) and "pitchees" (those receiving the pitches, my terminology). He often felt that he and April, and other "pitchers" at the Encuentro were in a position of vulnerability with respect to the potential collaborators. He said,

> After three years, two, three years of working on a script, putting together a proposal for a cast, a proposal for locations, spending money [...] you arrive as a beggar, pleading with a producer who is opting to feed his ego with the fact that you need someone to support you. (Gerber Interview)[83]

With that in mind, Gerber said he felt that way then, and he still felt that way in 2013 when interviewed. However, he clarified that he still valued pitching markets, even if the power relationship was one that he found unbalanced. Gerber's recommendation was that coordinators should protect the projects a bit more, by vetting more tightly the attendee possible funders, along the lines of how tightly they vet the participating projects

[83] Translated from original Spanish.

themselves (Gerber Interview). For her part, Schmucler commented that she recognized that a lot of the projects at the market including theirs were higher risk projects, as opposed to commercial projects; she noted that it is, on the whole, difficult to convince investors to finance riskier projects, even those with the possibility of funding them. She also discussed how she has learned in subsequent years, to be wary of investors who might steal from you or take over your project from you; that for these types of projects money may not solve all problems if it comes from the wrong source. Schmucler revealed that if she had known this at the time, it might have helped her better focus her energies as well as expectations for their participation (Schmucler Interview).

After the Encuentro in 2007, Gerber and Schmucler found themselves essentially in the same place with the project development as they had been in when they arrived. Upon returning to Mexico City, Gerber followed up with the people to whom he had handed the script. Only a few replied, and none moved forward formally with him. According to his recollection, the only concrete relationship established at the Encuentro was with the New Art representative, who ended up giving them a good discount on work completed with them. He found himself convinced again that he and April would have to produce the film without an official co-producing partner. In mid 2007, Gerber continued working on the script, and participated in the Buenos Aires Lab (BAL), as well as in a script workshop in Mexico with mentor Vicente Leñero. At that point, Gerber saw two options for moving forward: either funds through IMCINE's program Fondo para la Producción Cinematográfica de Calidad (Fund for the Production of Quality Films, or FOPROCINE) or through the CCC's first feature production support ("Sobre Vaho").

They were leaning towards applying to the CCC first feature program, but the call for entries to that was delayed, so they applied to FOPROCINE (Gerber Interview). According to IMCINE records, Vaho was awarded just shy of $7 million MXP through

FOPROCINE in 2007 (México, IMCINE, "Fondo de FOPROCINE 2001-2012"). For the filmmakers, this meant that, even thought the grant was not enough to see the project all the way through, they needed to move so they did not waste that opportunity (Gerber Interview). It took about two years from the time they received funding through FOPROCINE, to arrive to the completion of the project. Gerber's independent company, Albricias Producción, was the only production company; FOPROCINE funds mostly covered shooting and editing, and a little of the post-production. The HBF awarded Vaho funds that went towards post-production, and the Global Film Initiative awarded Vaho an advance for US distribution, which also helped them finish the film.

Vaho was released in 2009. As a first feature, with a challenging narrative structurally and thematically, and an unknown, largely non-professional cast, its success has not surprisingly been measurable along art cinema lines. The film opened in FICM in 2009, earning an honorable mention from the jury. Vaho also played at the International Film Festival Rotterdam (IFFR), and other international festivals in 2010, including picking up the Jury Award at the Marrakech International Film Festival. Global Film Initiative (GFI) picked up rights to the film for the US and Canada, and circulated the film through its distribution channels, featuring it as part of its 2010 Global Lens series. Austral Films based in Argentina handled festival circuit promotion through its channels. Both GFI and Austral Films still include the title in their catalogs at the time of this writing. In comparison to Cinco días, which balanced national and international acclaim, Vaho's success in reaching audiences has largely been outside of Mexico. Notably Vaho was nominated for only one Ariel for original music, and was otherwise overlooked by the Mexican Academy. An article posted on IMCINE's site dated June of 2010 noted Rotterdam's support for Vaho, the film's success in Morelia, and its screening at the Museum of Modern Art in New York. Despite this, its theatrical release in Mexico was

reportedly limited: only ten prints for the premiere weekend and not in the best theaters, at least not in the ones that Gerber had hoped for (Díaz Rodríguez).

CONCLUSIONS, FICG AND THE ENCUENTRO DE COPRODUCCIÓN 2005-2011

As we consider the case studies of the above films, within the context of FICG and its Industry area, they offer a window into specific moments along particular productions lines. As with participants in the IPM in Guanajuato, the interviewed participants in the Encuentro in Guadalajara applied to the event with particular goals in mind. Based on their accounts, it was for them an exciting and promising opportunity to advance their project from idea into reality. In these examples, Chenillo was able to point to immediate results and support that helped her directly, based on her participation with Cinco días sin Nora, while Gerber's and Schmucler's accounts with respect to Vaho were more reminiscent of the case study films from the IPM at EEC/GIFF, that we reviewed in Chapter 4.

What really stood out from Gerber's and Schmucler's interviews about the Encuentro, and which resonates with the accounts from the IPM, was that for filmmakers early in their careers, participation in activities like the IPM or Encuentro is especially charged with expectation. They are in need of investors in order to make their first films, and networks in order to sustain careers in the longer term. At the same time, these filmmakers seems particularly vulnerable to over-investing hope that someone will jump on board with funds. The power imbalance noted by Gerber, and the reflections from Schmucler about learning after the Encuentro what kinds of strings can be attached to money, indicate that the filmmakers who arguably could most benefit from the networking facilitated by such events (because it is early in their career) also may not be not quite ready yet to approach the events on those terms. Because networking takes a

great deal of patience and the ability to put the experience into long-term perspective, it is less likely to be about the "now" but instead more likely about the future. In any case, each of the writer/directors profiled here for the Encuentro case studies did eventually see their projects through to completion and to audiences. They also learned aspects of the business from their meetings there, including the importance of the right connections to the eventual production of their films.

With reference to Table 4, Chenillo and Gerber are part of a minority of filmmakers who completed their films after attending the Encuentro. For this table, I included films that participated in the Encuentro if it was registered initially as a Mexican-repped project and/or it was completed with Mexican producers or coproducers. Based on this sample, as of December of 2013, 23 of 62 projects (or 37.1%) of the films were reported as completed. This number is greater than the completion rate calculated for the IPM, which came in at 27.1% as of the same cut-off for data collection. Although further research would need to be conducted to confirm relevant factors and statistical significance, based on the organization of the respective initiatives, it could be that projects at the Encuentro benefitted from factors including the following that distinguish the event from the IPM:

- The Encuentro is an activity that was founded within a festival that was almost 20 years old at the time, and after an International Market had been established there. This had an effect on who was in attendance as possible investors. The IPM was launched at a younger festival and was the only event of its type at EEC at the time.
- The Encuentro was designed to allow for self-selection of meetings between participants, while the IPM set meeting agendas where each project met with each invited industry representative. Perhaps self-selection was a factor in Encuentro

meetings generating interest and perhaps more possibility for collaboration, especially as the Encuentro matured and producers (like Schmucler) were more savvy about whom to invite to a private meeting.

Year	No. Mexican projects (prod or co-prod)	No. completed by end of 2013	No. with festival screening(s)	No. released Mexico	No. with international release
2005	11	5	5	4	3
2006	10	6	6	4	1
2007	7	3	3	3	0
2008	7	3	3	1	3
2009	6	3	3	3	1
2010	14	2	2	1	1
2011	7	1	0	1	0

Table 4: Overview of Mexican Projects' Status from the Encuentro de Coproducción, 2005-2011[84]

As with the IPM, the investigations that were conducted on the Encuentro have pointed to possibilities for future research that would provide nuance to the current data, as well as continue to illuminate the pros and cons for filmmakers of participation in the event. The Encuentro case studies were chosen because the two films were different in terms of content, style, and eventual funding models. Taking a closer look at their histories did reveal a number of important points about the Encuentro from the filmmakers' perspectives. However, support for a film in development can be marked along a number of axes, and a couple of variables revealed themselves through the course of the research for this chapter which had not been evident based on the IPM. The first is

[84] Sources: Data compiled from IMCINE databases and publications; IMDb Pro data; last updated end of year 2013. The above includes only narrative features that participated in the Encuentro de Coproducción, that signed up as Mexican projects and/or that listed Mexican producers or coproducers upon completion.

evidence pointing to the impact of awards on a film's chances for completion, and the second is evidence pointing to the reach of FICG in terms of attracting industry delegates to the "Encuentro Iberoamericano de Coproducción Cinematográfica" whose participation actually led to Ibero-American Coproductions. The question of the impact of awards may seem self-evident if we consider the winner of the I Encuentro in 2005, when, as noted previously, Párpados azules took home the prizes. The prizes included support from Estudios Churubusco Azteca, New Art Digital, and LCI Seguros, amongst others, with these three being listed in IMDbPro credits (FICG, "Informe 2005"; "Blue Eyelids"). Nonetheless, it would be important to investigate from the filmmaker's perspective how significant each prize's support actually was in completing the project, rather than to take it at face value that the prizes were determining factors.

The second interesting variable actually became evident when determining what projects to track for inclusion in Table 4, as well as in reviewing reports and records from the festival. There were a number of projects that applied to the Encuentro from countries other than Mexico, but when completed, listed Mexico as a coproduction country. In festival records, the filmmakers of La Yuma (2009, Dir. Florence Jaugey), who were from Camila Films from Nicaragua, reported that as a result of the pitch in 2005 at the I Encuentro, they were able to attract a Mexican producer. Additionally, after working on the script further, they had plans to go into production in fall of 2007 with coproducers Miguel Necoechea of Ivania Films—Mexico—and José María Morales of Wanda Visión—Spain (FICG, "I Encuentro"; A. Stavenhagen, "Seguimiento"). The film was completed as a coproduction between Camila Films, Ivania Films, and Wanda Visión.

With investigation, other films likely would prove to have fit this pattern, namely: a business opportunity for Mexican companies to come on board as coproducers of films from other countries, as a direct result from meetings at the Encuentro. Preliminarily we

can point to four additional films that would warrant specific inquiry. In 2006, the film 18 cigarillos y medio (2010, Dir. Marcelo Adrián Tolces) registered for the II Encuentro as a Paraguay production; the film was completed as a Mexico/Paraguay coproduction. In 2008, the film Agua fría de mar (Cold Water of the Sea, 2010, Dir. Paz Fábrega) registered for the IV Encuentro as a Costa Rica production; it was completed as a Costa Rica/France/Spain/The Netherlands/Mexico coproduction. In 2008, the film Tanta agua (So Much Water, 2013, Dirs. Ana Guevara and Leticia Jorge) registered for the IV Encuentro as a Uruguay production; it was completed as an Uruguay/Mexico/The Netherlands/Germany coproduction. Finally, in 2010, the film La sirga (Towrope, 2012, Dir. William Vega) registered for the VI Encuentro as a Colombia production; it was completed as a Colombia/Mexico/France coproduction (FICG, "II Encuentro"; "IV Encuentro"; "Dossier FICG Español 2010"). If these coproductions were results of meetings at the Encuentro, or even at the Mercado Iberoamericano in general, then FICG would be able to point to direct ways that its activities have sustained or boosted Mexican production companies' output over the past years.

This initial evidence certainly points to a measure of success for the Encuentro that aligns with the mission of Industry at FICG, articulated in 2011 in the opening remarks to the Industry Catalog: "Our goal is to keep offering, as up to date, a warm and suitable business scenario that will contribute in a relevant manner to the production and circulation of films from our region" (FICG26, Industria 7). Additional interviews or similar follow up with participants and other stakeholders would be able to provide a more complete picture, useful for evaluation along the lines discussed previously for the IPM: (1) assessing realistic expectations for filmmakers who apply to participate in the Encuentro; (2) identifying what kinds of projects at what stages of realization have proven attractive to what kinds of co-producers and/or investors in attendance; and (3)

developing profiles of producers or other industry investors most likely to attach to a project at the Encuentro and have the capacity to see it through.

One aspect of FICG that makes it especially challenging to study over time is the turnover at all levels of direction and of staff. This includes Festival Directors, as noted in the historical overview, since the first year of the Market, Festival direction has changed hands twice, from Márquez to Sánchez Sosa in the lead up to the 2006 FICG, and then to Trujillo in 2011. Each person has brought to the table different visions, contacts, and strengths. In 2012, in a report for Film Comment from the 27th FICG, Robert Koehler reflected on the role of the FICG in the Ibero-American cinema circuit, noting that its dominance had waned in recent years as other festivals competed for prominence. He also highlighted the following:

> With FICCO's[85] collapse (a saga unto itself) a few years ago, and Mexican film production seeing a major uptick (the 2011-2012 period saw over 60 narrative features and nearly as many docs in process or completed), Guadalajara had a chance to grow to a new level. The irony is that, with Trujillo as the new director in 2011 and a big move to the city's main convention center, the beneficiary has been the market side, not the festival. Although some key players were absent this year (such as heavy-hitting UniFrance), anyone paying attention noticed that the market worked like a well-oiled machine. ("Festivals")

As with any projects or institutions as big as FICG and its Industry area, the change that Koehler pointed to was built on preceding efforts, in particular the foundation that Sánchez Sosa and his team had worked to fortify. Andrea Stavenhagen credited Sánchez with turning the festival towards the Market and Industry activities, working to attract more professionals, buyers, producers, and sales agents to Guadalajara (A. Stavenhagen Interview). The leadership in Industry and therefore subdirection had also experienced

[85] FICCO stands for the Festival Internacional de Cine Contemporáneo, or Mexico City International Contemporary Film Festival, a festival based in Mexico City that had started to gain traction and was well respected, but had trouble with financial viability. FICCO was cancelled prior to the 7th edition in 2010.

change over the years. Most notably Stavenhagen and Alejandra Paulín, who had been architects of the Industry area since the early Mercado days would move on after 2013, and in 2014, Estrella Araiza stepped in as Industry and Market Director. It remains to be seen how her direction along with Trujillo, will play out in the longer term.

Interestingly, in 2011, when Trujillo took the reigns as Director of FICG, his introductory remarks in the catalog did not mention the Industry area or any of its activities, except for a brief mention of the Talent Campus. Instead he focused on the festival's planned tributes (FICG, Catálogo del FICG26 39). Trujillo may have been taking into account other factors in context besides Industry, with his focus on the festival's "front of house" content. Notably, the landscape of film festivals in Mexico had changed drastically in the years preceding his appointment. When the Muestra de Cine Mexicano was founded in 1986, it was pretty much the only player in Mexico hosting a film event of that type. The only other major event was the Muestra Internacional de Cine (International Film Showcase) of Cineteca Nacional in Mexico City an event founded in 1971. When EEC was founded in 1998, and as the Muestra took on more of the character of an international festival the two organizations were the leaders. The 1990s was before the boom in film festivals, before digital media, before the FICM and others would join the conversation as the third major film festival in 2003. Other significant film festivals were just getting going in the 2000s, for example:

- the Festival Internacional de Cine de Monterrey (Monterrey International Film Festival, FICMonterrey), founded as the Festival Internacional de Cine y Video Voladero (Voladero International Film and Video Festival) in 2000, rebranding to FICMonterrey in 2005,

- the Festival Internacional de Cine Contemporáneo (Mexico City International Contemporary Film Festival, FICCO) launched in 2004, collapsed before 2010's edition,
- The Festival Internacional de Cine Documental de la Ciudad de México (the Mexico City International Documentary Film Festival, DocsDF), launched in 2006,
- Ambulante, an itinerant documentary film festival, launched in 2006.

Trujillo conscientiously calling attention to the festival as a leader on this stage, its ability to attract national and international auteurs to its events, to screen new work and retrospectives, and to pay tribute to distinguished guests—which included the esteemed Mexican actor Diana Bracho, and recognized visionaries Fernando Trueba (Spain) and Werner Herzog (German)—demonstrate that he had an eye on the festival's reputation in local and global contexts.

That said, the first welcoming remarks in this same catalog were by the long-serving President of the FICG Foundation, Raúl Padilla López, and they highlighted many facets of what I have designated as "behind the screens" activities. Padilla's intro described the festival as being comprised of complimentary segments, stating: "A fourth festival included in FICG is the ever more vigorous Film Industry and Market Section that has become a benchmark for the development of projects in Ibero-America, for negotiating rights and for fostering and consolidating business" (Catálogo del FICG26 32). As FICG struggles to maintain significance within the Mexican and Ibero-American film circuits, especially as other Ibero-American business opportunities like Ventana Sur in Buenos Aires gather steam, new leaders will face the challenge of how to be on the cutting edge, how to be a "must-attend" event, how to be a field-configuring event.

The move for FICG's Industry to a new venue that Koehler mentioned was part of that strategy; the Expo Center in Guadalajara provided for a huge upgrade in space and possibilities for better technical support in a number of areas, including the Industry videotheque and library, film and work-in-progress screenings and panels. The Expotec, a space for company stands to demonstrate their services and technologies, expanded substantially as it moved from a hotel space to a convention center space. In her first year as Industry and Market Director, Arraiza's introductory remarks pointed to a vision aimed at rebranding for new generations, including launching the new hashtag "We Are All Industry." Prioritizing the Market as "the most important activity in this new identity," Arraiza wrote:

> All industries have consumers. In the film industry, the consumers are the spectators. We want to give the leading role to all parts of the chain that lead films to theatres, televisions, tablets or smartphones. We want to approach young media, to discover the promise of VOD and to get close to all new digital platforms. We understand that even if films, windows and ourselves are on new platforms, negotiations are still done in a personal way. Guadalajara Industry presents this opportunity. (FICG29, Industria 7)

However, it is clear that even while Arraiza highlighted the Market, the events of Industry remained committed to fostering works in development or production, as the Producers Network, the Encuentro de Coproducción, and Guadalajara Construye were focal points of the Industry Catalog. Additionally the Industry Talks section included a presentation dedicated to the launch of a new collaboration in 2014 between FICG, the Guadalajara International Book Fair, and Ventana Sur, a "space destined to promote the sales of literary work for its adaptation to film" (FICG29, Industria 178). The impact of FICG on the film industry and vice versa has been an ongoing process, and FICG's Industry activities, including the Encuentro, will need to continue to adjust and adapt stay

ahead of the curve, and above all, if they aim to provide meaningful support to filmmakers through their programs.

For the moment, as with GIFF, historicizing and analyzing the Festival and Industry aspects of FICG remains an ongoing and complex task. This applies as well to the final festival of this project, the Morelia International Film Festival (FICM), and the Morelia Lab. The youngest of the three festivals, FICM is by no means a minor player. The most recently founded initiative, Morelia Lab, also held its own and differentiated itself from the Industry activities at both GIFF and FICG. Of the three activities, the Lab is the most unique in origin and trajectory, as will be demonstrated in the next chapter. As such, it provides for complimentary analytical discussions and insight into Mexican production in the early 2000s, including that a particular approach to support was needed at the level of the training for producers, given that formal training outside of apprenticeships was a relatively new phenomenon in Mexican history.

Chapter 6: Morelia: A Festival for Mexican Talent and Host of Morelia Lab

> I think festivals open up a complimentary universe to the universities. I think that even though universities have their training centers, which include a good and solid formation for producers, festivals compliment these efforts, in the way that they bring together the living, working industry.
> - Andrea Stavenhagen, co-director of Morelia Lab

> Together with the Morelia festival, we decided to put together a different kind of workshop, thinking more about people than projects. Your project is very important, but what we want is for producers to grow. If you decide to abandon a project and work on another, what we are interested in is training, and providing tools, and surrounding producers with their peers. We want them to understand the consequences of committing to a project.
> - Carlos Taibo, co-director of Morelia Lab[86]

In the early 2000s, a new festival based in the city of Morelia, in the central state of Michoacán, would join those in Guadalajara and Guanajuato; the three would lead the way in presentations of national and international films, as well as debate about the state of Mexican film at the time. In the state of Jalisco, the "Muestra de Cine Mexicano en Guadalajara" which was founded in 1986 as a showcase for Mexican cinema was in the process of rebranding itself as an Ibero-American festival: the Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara (Guadalajara International Film Festival, or FICG). The festival Expresión en Corto (EEC)[87] in San Miguel de Allende and Guanajuato Capital, in the state of Guanajuato, was a few years old and gaining momentum as a significant forum; EEC would rebrand in 2011 as the Festival Internacional de Cine Guanajuato (Guanajuato International Film Festival, or GIFF). Founded in 1998, EEC's programming during its early years was anchored in short form and documentary films, heavily favoring Mexican productions in the selection. In 2003, the Festival Internacional

---

[86] Andrea Stavenhagen, personal interview, 09 Jan. 2013; Carlos Taibo, personal interview, 26 Apr. 2013. Translated from Spanish.

[87] The festival name "Expresión en Corto" is not traditionally translated into English. See chapter 4, note 35.

de Cine de Morelia (Morelia International Film Festival, or FICM) launched with the primary objective of establishing itself as the Mexican cinema festival in the country. FICM's timing was certainly auspicious taking into account that the dominant perception at the time was that national cinema was in dire shape, a perspective affirmed by some of the worst production numbers in Mexico's history: 28 features in 2000, 21 in 2001, and 14 in 2002 (México, IMCINE, Anuario 2014 19).

However, in the face of these statistics, during the early 2000s, each of the festivals in their own ways held to three important beliefs about Mexican cinema that were obscured by the numbers. First, their program selections demonstrated that feature-length films were not the only ones being produced in Mexico. As a prominent example, all the festivals' short film showcases consistently featured Mexican films from all over the country, and these were important anchors in each case as opposed to second thoughts. Second, the festivals included retrospectives of Mexican films in their programs, indicating that the circumstance the national industry was in, if really as grim as it might seem, should not be conflated with all of Mexican film history. There was plenty to celebrate and be proud of in their culture and arts. Third, the low number of features actually being completed was neither reflective of a lack of creativity within the film community, nor of a lack of writers or directors with ideas, but rather of infrastructural weaknesses. Sustained cycles of favoritism and corruption, facilitated by economic and political turmoil in the country, had resulted in closed filmmaking circles, leaving many filmmakers unable to access funds. On top of that, the industry was especially vulnerable in a particular area: experienced, professional, producers who could see projects through.

As we have seen with both FICG and EEC, and we will address with FICM, the festivals were not content to remain in the traditional role of promoting national film and

filmmakers through exhibition of representative work. They moved into what was a new trend in world festivals at the time, like Sundance, Cannes, the International Film Festival Rotterdam (IFFR), and the Berlinale—the Mexican-based FICG, EEC, and FICM added initiatives to their offerings that specifically supported filmmakers at the level of works in progress. By the third edition of FICM, all of the festivals each had a signature event along these lines: the International Pitching Market (IPM) in Guanajuato which first took place in July 2004, the Encuentro de Coproducción[88] in Guadalajara which launched in March 2005, and Morelia Lab in Morelia beginning in October of 2005.

The festival in Morelia was founded by individuals who, as a team, brought extensive experience in arts promotion to the table, including in the curation and exhibition of films. The Director of the festival, Daniela Michel, had for many years co-organized an event in Mexico City at the Cineteca Nacional (the National Film Archive) which consolidated under the name "La Jornada de Cortometraje Mexicano," a celebration and presentation of Mexican Short Films.[89] In coordination with Alejandro Ramírez Magaña and Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas Batel, who took on the roles of President and Vice President of FICM, they together launched the festival in 2003. Ramírez' family founded Cinépolis, based in Morelia, currently the largest exhibition company in Latin America and one of the biggest in the world; he has worked at Cinépolis since 1996, and held the CEO position since 2006 (Fuchs). Cárdenas Batel is part of a family with close ties to Mexican politics, including his grandfather Lázaro Cárdenas del Río, President of Mexico from 1934 to 1940. For his part Cárdenas Batel established a public life in support of arts and culture, including as key partner in the realization of FICM. Since its

---

[88] See Chapter 5, note 58.

[89] "Jornada" is challenging to translate into English in this type of context. It generally signifies a day or event, or congress, or conference, or assembly, which is organized around a particular topic, and brings people together for an intense day or a few days focused on that topic and associated issues.

founding through the time of this study, the festival has been run with these three at the helm.

This chapter is divided into four primary sections, in similar fashion to those on GIFF and FICG, as follows: (1) a descriptive history of FICM from the first festival in 2003 through the tenth in 2012;[90] (2) a presentation of the inspiration for Morelia Lab and the shape it has taken as it developed; (3) a discussion of two case study films which have participated in the Lab, Pastorela (2011, Dir. Emilio Portes) in 2007 represented by producer Rodrigo Herranz Fanjul, and Fecha de caducidad (Expiration Date, 2012, Dir. Kenya Márquez) in 2009 represented by producer Karla Uribe González; and (4) an overview and preliminary analysis of Morelia Lab projects' status, focusing on Mexican narrative feature film productions or coproductions. As before, the relationship between "front of house" festival activities and those that take place "behind the screens," out of the public's eye will be explored. Additionally, the outcomes experienced by producers who participated in the Lab will be contextualized relative to the goals of the participants, the organizers, and other stakeholders interested in the revitalization and long-term viability of Mexican cinema.

In distinction to other the two festivals and their industry initiatives, Morelia Lab's co-directors have operated a bit more autonomously. As will be explained further in this chapter, FICM's organizers have explicitly not created Market or Industry areas,[91]

---

[90] For the sake of a cut-off for analysis of activities across chapters, I have previously largely focused on the festival histories through 2011. This is so that there is at least a little bit of time between the present and the past, to look back on the initiatives under review—the International Pitching Market (IPM) at Guanajuato and the Encuentro de Coproducción at Guadalajara. For this chapter, since Morelia celebrated its tenth year in 2012, I decided to look at its first decade. This does not affect consistency in the overview analysis years (see pages 289+ of this chapter), since in 2012 Morelia Lab featured a documentary section. Therefore, the Morelia Lab cut-off is 2011 for analysis of participating Mexican narrative features, just as with the IPM and the Encuentro.

[91] In this project, I use a capital "I" for Industry when referring to the particular events, activities, and organization that a festival identifies as its "Industria" or "Industry" area, in contrast to the general film

because their focus was on creating a different kind of environment, one that connected Mexican filmmakers with national and international talent in a more organic manner (Michel Interview). However, when they were approached by the Instituto Mexicano de la Cinematografía (the Mexican Cinematographic Institute, or IMCINE) about an endeavor that would mentor producers, the leadership of the FICM was open to the proposal (Michel Interview; Ugalde Interview). There was a broad industrial recognition that experienced producers were few and far between in Mexico, and that national productions were suffering in quality and numbers in good part because of this (Taibo Interview). IMCINE partnered with FICM to provide infrastructure and resources for Morelia Lab from its first iteration. The primary architects of Morelia Lab were Carlos Taibo, an established Mexican film producer and professor of film production, and Andrea Stavenhagen, who—as is evidenced in previous chapters of this project—has built a career in film promotion and support of film production through various Mexican institutions. Their industry knowledge and connections were leveraged to create an environment uniquely suited to mentoring producers through development, production and promotion of film projects; they started out working with Mexican producers and then beginning with year three, they incorporated Latin American producers into the selected participants.

As with all of the festivals studied for this project, with FICM, Morelia Lab, and the case study films, I was particularly interested is the contextualization of the experience of the producers participating in the Lab. Their narratives provide insight into where two sets of expectations intersect and the ways they inform each other: the creative team's vision for the particular project they were working on at the time they applied to

---

festival activities—as do both the Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara (FICG, Guadalajara International Film Festival) and the Guanajuato International Film Festival (GIFF).

the Lab, and the greater industrial stakeholders' investments in developing such projects as a way to sustain Mexican cinema. FICM as an event has served to attract local, national, and international industry representatives to the city of Morelia for the period of time delimited by the festival dates. Within an overlapping timeframe, Morelia Lab has operated as a meeting place and intense training ground, bringing together producers with other attending producers, as well as with other industry agents for a few days. They are both part of a mutually supporting system, which I will consider to be field-configuring events; each has participated in flows of culture and capital especially with respect to Mexican films and filmmakers.

Of the initiatives examined in this dissertation, Morelia Lab may be the most "invisible" to festival attendees, in large part because it is not part of an "Industry" section; this has meant that even members of the film industry attending FICM may not be aware of the Lab. Participants can and do cross over between the Lab and FICM's festival guests and "front of house" festivities, but the Lab has its own set of activities for participants only, and engagement with the Lab is purposefully limited to those participants. As this chapter will tackle in later sections, this separation has been established in part because of the mission of the Lab itself: to create an environment of education and mentoring for producers, who are in need of particular professional skill sets. In essence, the Lab has been envisioned from its creation as a formational experience as opposed to an overtly business opportunity. Similar to GIFF and FICG's initiatives, the Lab is considered distinct from other types of training or educational systems available to aspiring filmmakers, yet interconnected with them as well. As will be illustrated through the case studies and corresponding overview analysis of this chapter, because of its unique approach, the Lab is even more challenging to evaluate in terms of benchmarks for "success" and "failure" than the IPM or the Encuentro. An even

longer term approach, and one that is more connected to tracking the individual participant than the accepted project, is necessary for the Lab. Before we get to that, though, it is important to first discuss the origins and trajectory of FICM and Morelia Lab as they have developed over the years.

OVERVIEW: MORELIA INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL

In 2012, the FICM celebrated its tenth edition in style. One could presume that because it is younger than the other two festivals—seventeen years younger than FICG and five years younger than GIFF—it would have been correspondingly smaller in terms of profile and international reach. However, that was not the case; from the very beginning, when FICM opened in 2003, major guests and presentations of the highest caliber were already in place. As noted in this chapter's introduction, one of the major factors behind FICM's initial big launch was the founding festival director Michel's experience and contacts. The history of the festival can be broken down into two phases that align with its major competition lineups. During the first phase, from 2003 through 2006, the festival's competitions featured a Mexican short film showcase and a documentary film showcase. The second phase of FICM begins with 2007 when the coordinating team believed there were sufficient Mexican films to comprise a narrative feature competition, and the festival opened the call for entries to include them (Michel Interview).

The historical section that follows discusses both of these phases, as well as situates the development of Morelia Lab within the trajectory and missions of FICM as it quickly anchored itself as one of the three major film festivals running in Mexico.

From the Cineteca Nacional to Morelia, 2003-2006

Many years before the founding of FICM, Michel was instrumental in launching a program at the Cineteca in Mexico City to showcase Mexican short films. In a recent interview with this author, Michel recalled that, in 1994, she and colleague Enrique Ortiga observed that there was no place to see or show Mexican short films. There were no festivals dedicated to short films, and the Cineteca did not have any programming dedicated to Mexican shorts. So she and Ortiga coordinated the first program of Mexican short films at the Cineteca with roughly a couple hundred dollars. This became the Jornada de Cortometraje Mexicano, and Michel was very devoted to it; even though it was an uphill battle in terms of funding, she found a high degree of creativity from young Mexican filmmakers evident in those shorts. In 2000, she met Ramírez and together they decided to run the short film selections in Morelia. They also added some documentaries to the program. When questioned about the move from Mexico City to Morelia, Michel explained why Morelia was a good host city for the program, citing: its recognition as a United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage Center; its history as a University city; its proximity to Mexico City by highway; the fact that the city is easily navigable for attendees, facilitating access to activities; and that Cinépolis' corporate offices are there. Ramírez offered his and Cinépolis' support and as noted previously, the chain is a major exhibitor not just in Mexico but in the world (Michel Interview). With the initial programs in Morelia, Michel and Ramírez began to garner support, and together with Cárdenas Batel, they formalized the founding of the FICM.

The first FICM in October of 2003 coincided with the 7th Jornada of Mexican Short Films—a continuation of the program that Michel and team had coordinated previously at the Cineteca. The same year, FICM inaugurated a program they named the

1st Jornada of Mexican Documentary Films. The festivals' two competitions corresponded to these categories, featuring almost fifty fiction, documentary, and animated shorts in the Mexican Short Film Competition, and ten medium and feature-length films in the Mexican Documentary Film Competition. Its guest roster was impressive from the very first year. So much so, that in coverage of the festival that year, typified by reports such as Jorge Caballero's of La Jornada, the invitees and feature highlights typically eclipsed information about the competition lineups themselves. Leading up to the event, Caballero reported that the jury for the aforementioned short competition was to include such esteemed members as Mexican filmmakers Carlos Cuarón and Carlos Carrera, a representative from the British Film Institute, and another from the La Semaine Internationale de la Critique (International Critics' Week) at Cannes. The documentary jury included the Mexican documentarian Juan Carlos Rulfo, US documentarian Arthur Dong,[92] and a representative from the International Film Festival Rotterdam.

Opening night and other special screenings garnered attention, and deservedly so. FICM aimed to establish a reputation as a leading promoter of Mexican films, and its choice of inaugural film fit the bill. The festival launched with the Mexican premiere of the film Nicotina (Nicotine, 2003, Dir. Hugo Rodríguez), a Mexican/Argentine/Spanish coproduction starring Diego Luna. Nicotina had bowed a month earlier at the Toronto International Film Festival (TIFF), and would go on to other festival dates, theatrical releases including in Mexico and the US, and a good deal of attention at the Mexican Ariel awards. The international invited guest list featured Werner Herzog, along with special presentations of his films Aguirre, the Wrath of God (1972) and My Best Fiend

[92] In Caballero's article he misspells jury member Arthur Dong's last name as Donne.

(1999). Director Barbet Schroeder and screenwriter Fernando Vallejo were honored during a screening of their film La virgen de los sicarios (Our Lady of the Assassins, 2000). These films and guest invitations set a tone of intercultural exchange that was essential to Michel's vision for the festival. When reflecting on how she chose invitations not just the first year but subsequent, Michel stated:

> We invited the great masters of international cinema so that they could share with us, and with the young Mexican filmmakers, their vision of filmmaking. [...] I believe it is important that in Mexico we learn about what is happening in world cinema as a point of reference. (Michel Interview)[93]

The festival also established a tradition of paying tribute to the history of film and filmmakers from the state of Michoacán, by celebrating the life and work of Miguel Contreras Torres in coordination with the Filmoteca of the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (National Autonomous University of Mexico, or UNAM) and Video Universal. Contreras Torres was born in Morelia in 1899 and his filmography spanned 1920 to 1964; in total the first edition of FICM presented one of his short films and six features, including the Spanish-French-Mexican coproduction El león de Sierra Morena (The Lion of Sierra Morena, 1929), the US-Mexican coproduction The Mad Empress (1939), and the Mexican historical drama El rayo del sur (The Lightening Bolt of the South, 1943). The festival wrapped with a screening of Salma Hayek's directorial debut, The Maldonado Miracle (2003), starring Peter Fonda, Mare Winningham, and Rubén Blades, which had premiered at Sundance in 2003 (FICM, Primer festival 31, 96-111).

In between opening and closing night, the festival screened an impressive lineup for any festival, and especially for an inaugural year; the catalog's index lists 130 films across the selection categories (Primer festival 2-3). Official sections included those

[93] Translated from original Spanish.

already listed, plus sections for International Critics' Week, Short Films from Michoacán, Short and Documentary Films out of Competition, and Feature Films. The "out of competition" works included films from Mexico, and the Feature Films a selection of international films, including Dogville (2003, Dir. Lars von Trier), The Divorce (2003, Dir. James Ivory), and Respiro (2002, Dir. Emanuele Crialese). Additionally, FICM hosted a series of panels, as noted in the catalog: "Tendencias en la producción de largometrajes mexicanos / Trends in Mexican Feature Production" led by film professionals including Mauricio Durán and Gabriel Ripstein; "El auge de los medios de comunicación indígenas / Indigenous Media on the Rise" moderated by filmmaker and curator Jesse Lerner; "Producción de cortometrajes IMCINE / Short Film Production from IMCINE" moderated by then IMCINE Director Alfredo Joskowicz; and "Becas de Artes Audiovisuales en México / Media Arts Fellowships in Mexico" hosted by Tania Blanich, Director of the Program for Media Artists, and featuring fellowship recipients (Primer festival 75, 77).

It rounded out to an inaugural festival focused on presenting Mexican film and filmmakers to national attendees and international guests, as well as celebrating some of the best in world cinema with the stated aim of inspiring Mexican talent (Michel Interview). The next few years of FICM followed similar patterns to the first, while adding sections to expand the scope of the festival's offerings. The second festival's introductory sections highlighted some of the visions that stakeholders had in the success of FICM in particular and Mexican film in general. For example, Joskowicz wrote:

> [T]he promotion of Mexican cinema depends on events like the Morelia International Film Festival. Such a festival not only offers us important international feedback on Mexican cinema, but also provides fertile ground for the task of supporting and promoting Mexican cinema in a fitting environment. (FICM, Segundo Festival 9)

In subsequent pages, a joint statement by festival President Ramírez, Director Michel, and Programming Director Shannon Kelley reflected on FICM's purpose:

> We ask ourselves, as we did a year ago: why does a festival exist? What, in fact, is its essence? Is it found in the assembly of such elements as entertainment, excitement, and novelty? Is it the sum of such varied parts as local production, classic retrospectives, and the prestige of feature premieres? A shift of focus arranges these elements in a compelling perspective, and we can see that while they are indispensable, a meaningful festival consists in the spaces between all of these: indeed, in the way it represents a coming together of people around the wonder of film. (Segundo Festival 11)

Together these selections reinforced that the organizers and invested sponsors were committed to the careful curation of a program that could meet the goal of connecting Mexican film with audiences, while also nurturing new creative talent through film screenings of national and international titles, invited guests and talks, and a general spirit of exuberance for the seventh art.

Since FICM launched as a mature film festival—with competitions and parallel programs, prestigious jury and prizes, red carpets, and the like—the program's modifications through the fourth edition are correspondingly more subtle than either FICG or GIFF which have both gone through major transformations since they were founded. For example in the second edition of FICM in 2004, the sections remained largely the same as the first, with a couple additions of note, a Shorts for Children selection and a Cinema Without Borders presentation. The latter showcased films about US-Mexico border issues, and was a fitting compliment to one of the year's featured panels, "The Other Side: Un cine sin fronteras / Del otro lado: A Cinema Without Borders" (Segundo Festival 3, 167).

The third edition mirrored the previous, and expanded in a few areas of special programming, for example a presentation of Belgian short films, a thirty-year

retrospective of work from Mexico's film school the Centro de Capacitación Cinematográfica (CCC), and a selection of films specially curated by the Fonds Sud. Also in 2005, FICM expanded its parallel activities section with more conferences and expositions than in previous years, including "the announcement of the Rockefeller Foundation Media Arts Fellowships, which have supported 74 media artists in Mexico since 1992 and champion indigenous video work" (James, "Mexico Rising"). Another major highlight of the year was the introduction of the first Morelia Lab. The first year of Morelia Lab was incredibly broad in scope, hosting forty young Mexican producers for eleven days, and offering them a series of conferences led by national and international guests; the events were split between Mexico City and the city of Morelia. Later in this chapter, we will return to and elaborate on the history of Morelia Lab. Before that, it is important to continue to describe the evolution of the hosting festival, FICM.

In early 2006, a couple months after the third edition, the journal Sight and Sound ran a profile and commentary about the festival, written by Nick James. It begins, "Most film festivals are about the search for hits or masterpieces but there's another kind closer to a spirit of real discovery. In Mexico there's an elegant event designed to open minds to cinema's democratic potential" ("Mexico Rising"). In the article, James elaborated on what many observers and participants have routinely pointed to as a delicate balancing act. FICM presents a broad selection of Mexican film, much of which may be characterized as rough technically or narratively, but strong on vision and commitment. Regarding a series of documentaries that ran in 2005 at FICM3, James wrote: "I describe all these not because they're exceptional or transcend the limitations of to-camera no-budget witness documentary—they're not and they don't—but because together they typify an intent to create communities of information." The uneven quality of the Mexican selection, both fiction and non-fiction, was contextualized as a celebration of the

promise inherent in the creative act and the hope that young filmmakers will mature and develop their skills. Furthermore, it was accompanied by a selection of critically acclaimed films that screened during the course of the year's festival, for example Tommy Lee Jones' The Three Burials of Melquiades Estrada (2005) and Werner Herzog's Grizzly Man (2005).

Notably, in the interim between the third and fourth FICM, a selection of Morelia's winning films screened in the International Critics' Week at Cannes for the second year in a row. The invitation had been consolidated through a partnership in which Jean-Christophe Berjon served as a Delegate on behalf of the Critics' Week beginning in 2004 (Berjon). What had begun as a vehicle through which to bring international cinema to Mexico, had resulted in an affiliation that provided for Mexican films to travel internationally and visibly at the highest level of the festival circuit. Then in 2005, during FICM3, Diego Luna announced the launching of the itinerant documentary film festival "Ambulante" as an initiative of the company Canana, best known as the production company that Luna, Gael García Bernal, and Pablo Cruz founded in 2005. Elena Fortes rounded out the Ambulante team as director of the non-profit and festival, and Morelia and Ambulante joined forces to promote the exhibition of documentary films throughout their country. In the spring of 2006, Ambulante's program of national and international films—including FICM's winners from its first three editions—ran in fifteen cities in Mexico, and the organizers were pleased with turnout and audience engagement (FICM, IV Festival 184). Ambulante in turn presented some films in special programs in 2006 at FICM4 (186-87). The two organizations continue to work together on cross-programming through the time of this writing.

The last year of FICM to be discussed in this section is the fourth edition, which took place in the fall of 2006. Leading up to the event, Michael O'Boyle wrote a short

preview of the festival for Variety, situating FICM as a major festival: "Competition at Morelia, Mexico's second-most important fest behind Guadalajara, includes 13 docus and 56 shorts." National press previews focused on the program with pride in the Mexican selection, for example, calling attention to the fact that four filmmakers from Guadalajara were in competition for Best Mexican Short (e.g. Martínez); afterwards press outlets covered winners, including highlighting that the FICM winning Mexican short "Dime lo que sientes," directed by Iria Gómez in 2004, was on an whirlwind tour of festivals, garnering awards both at home and abroad (Olvera). In 2006, FICM opened with Quinceañera (2006, Dir. Richard Glatzer and Wash Westmoreland), a film that had won both the Audience and Jury Awards at Sundance in January, and would go on to other nominations and accolades. The festival closed with Michel Gondry's internally acclaimed The Science of Sleep (2006) starring Gael García Bernal. In between opening and closing nights, they also hosted the Mexican premiere of Guillermo del Toro's masterpiece El laberinto del fauno (Pan's Labyrinth, 2006). Together, these three screenings accentuated Morelia's significant standing in the festival circuit, its prestige as a launching ground for major international films, and a showcase of serious Mexican talent; it was firmly established as a player within a short time after its founding. In 2006, these three major anchor films were complimented by what had become FICM's traditional categories of Mexican Short Films in Competition, Mexican Documentary in Competition, Michoacán Short Films in Competition, a selection from Cannes' International Critics' Week, Cinema Without Borders, a selection of national features and another of international, a Children's Program, and curated retrospective series and tributes.

New in 2006, the World Catholic Association for Communication (known as SIGNIS)[94] added a juried award to the FICM lineup, as they had already been doing with FICG and EEC/GIFF, to honor a "a high production quality work representing human values that contribute to the well being of our society and culture" (FICM, IV Festival 28-29). As had been a tradition from the beginning of FICM, the jury for the two major Mexican competition sections was comprised principally of international and renowned guests. For the FICM4, the Oscar and Emmy-nominated Jon Bloom, professor and film critic Carlos Bonfil, and film critic Pierre Murat served on the Mexican Short Jury. Sundance Institute's Joseph Beyer, producer Michael Fitzgerald, and documentary promoter and producer Yves Jeanneau comprised the Mexican Documentary Jury (FICM, IV Festival 19-24). This level of invited jury member is representative of Michel's stated mission to bring such talent to Morelia in order to inspire the next generation of filmmakers and cinephiles. In an interview with this author, Michel elaborated on her perspective, stating that the film world in Mexico was so small that it had been important to her that the jury not be formed of people who were all part of that limited circle (Michel Interview). Together, the tributes as well as the invited national and international guests have annually been selected with an eye towards providing a broad scope of potential inspiration to up-and-coming filmmakers. To this end, FICM in 2006 hosted a tribute to Fernando Méndez, one of Mexico's "B-movie" icons of the early to mid 20th century, and screened a number of his films, including El vampiro (The Vampire, 1957). Invited guests included celebrated filmmaker Mike Hodges with a retrospective, the enigmatic and talented Abel Ferrara with a special presentation of Mary (2005), and the acclaimed writer Jean-Claude Carrière, the collaborative genius behind films by some of

[94] SIGNIS formed in the 2002, as a merger between the International Catholic Organization for Cinema (OCIC) and the International Catholic Association for Radio and Television (UNDA) (FICM, IV Festival 28-29).

the world's greatest talents including Luis Buñuel and Jean-Luc Godard (FICM, IV Festival; O'Boyle).

As remarkable as the first few years of FICM were, FICM continued to evolve and adapt in subsequent years. Michel has remained a steady figure in promoting the festival and supporting Mexican filmmakers. When asked how the Morelia festival distinguishes itself from its competitors, she replied, "I believe this is the festival Mexican Film Festival 'par excellence'" (Michel Interview).[95] At the same time as the other two major film festivals in Mexico became more and more international in scope, Michel and her team worked to develop an international festival anchored steadfastly around competitive sections exclusively for Mexican films and a screenplay competition for Michoacán filmmakers.

Consolidating the Mexican Film Festival "par excellence"

Leading up to its fifth edition in 2007, the FICM leadership determined that for the first time the festival would feature a competition for Mexican narrative feature films, in addition to the previously established competition sections. The decision was predicated on their estimation that there were, for the first time since FICM's founding, a sufficient number of national films that could comprise an official competition section (Michel Interview). In opening catalog remarks, the joint introductory statement by Festival President Ramírez, Vice-President Cardenas Batel, and General Director Michel pronounced:

> The Morelia International Film Festival will launch a new category this year: the Mexican Feature Film competition for first or second-time directors. This new section will allow the FICM to further its mission: to provide a showcase for local talent and encourage up-and-coming filmmakers. The section's objective is to attract the best, most promising new Mexican features and offer their directors

[95] Translated from original Spanish.

> what Elisa Miller has called "a spring-board" to the international festival circuit. (FICM, 5º Festival 11)

The reference to Elisa Miller celebrated the fact that her short film "Ver llover" ("Watching it Rain," 2006) won Best Short Film at FICM in 2006, before going on to a successful festival run which included winning the Palm d'Or in the same category at Cannes in 2007.

FICM's prestige as a premier festival was firmly anchored by this point in its history. The addition of the new competition field caught international attention quickly in industry trades including The Holiday Reporter in 2007 and Variety by 2008 (e.g. Hecht, "'Orphanage'"; Young, "Morelia Fest"). The fifth FICM saw its share of celebrity attendees, and the inaugural ceremonies created quite a splash as the President of Mexico Felipe Calderón, from Morelia himself, addressed the audience and promised that the government would boost its support of Mexico's film industry (Hecht, "Dark Horse"). Guests and jury members included filmmaker Stephen Frears, Tribeca film festival director Peter Scarlet, and filmmaker Alfonso Cuarón, to name just a few (Hecht). Perhaps the most notable guest that year was Arthur Penn, who was honored with a tribute and a medal from the Filmoteca UNAM, and who presented the landmark film Bonnie and Clyde (1967) in celebration of its 50th anniversary, and also Little Big Man (1970), during the 2007 edition of the festival (FICM, 5º Festival 46-47; C. Márquez).

The lineup of six Mexican feature films in competition represented a number of prestigious films of international caliber. These included Cochochi (2007, Dir. Laura Amelia Guzmán and Israel Cárdenas), which had premiered at the Venice Film Festival, and then went on to win the Discovery Award at TIFF among other accolades. The arguable front-runner was La Zona (The Zone, 2007, Dir. Rodrigo Plá); La Zona also bowed in Venice where it won a number of awards, and then at TIFF it picked up the

International Critics' Award (FIPRESCI). The audience award at FICM went to a film that debuted in Morelia, Quemar las naves (Burn the Bridges) a coming-of-age drama directed by Francisco Franco and produced by Laura Imperiale. By all reports, the winner was a surprise, as the jury selected the low-budget, contemplative art house drama ¿Dónde están sus historias? (Where Are Their Stories?, 2007) directed by Nicolás Pereda (Hecht, "'Orphanage'" & "Dark Horse"). Pereda, who has lived primarily in Canada since he studied film at York University, had by that time started to establish himself in theater and art circles, and with ¿Dónde están? began to establish his reputation a filmmaker with attention to character and form. He returned to Mexico to work with a crew and actors there that he was comfortable with, and since then, Pereda has continued to prefer production and coproduction of his films in Mexico, even as his reputation on the international film circuit has grown. In any event, by the 2007 edition of FICM, with its guests, its overall lineup that continued to showcase national and international films, and the newly introduced selection of Mexican features in competition, the festival was firmly situated as "one of Mexico's most important movie showcases" ("Dark Horse").

Over the next few years, FICM would continue to grow in scale and significance. For example, in 2008, James Young of Variety reported that FICM6 would present "85 pics in competition, up 10% on 2007"; he also noted that "for the first time, the short film competition winner (fiction and animation) will be eligible for Oscar consideration" ("Morelia Fest"). The inaugural film in 2009 was Quentin Tarantino's Inglorious Basterds (2009), and Tarantino's presence made quite a splash, as the festival also screened a select retrospective of his films. Other special programs included a tribute to John Huston and films that he shot in Mexico, in a section entitled "México Imaginario / Imaginary Mexico," and a selection of films from Romania, as the coordinators of FICM7 decided to name a guest country for the first time ("Tarantino"; FICM, 7º Festival

12). Romanian director Cristian Mungiu, whose film 4 Months, 3 Weeks and 2 Days won the Palme d'Or at Cannes in 2007, amongst other accolades, was a jury member at FICM in 2008, and then served as collaborator and guest curator for his country's section at the FICM in 2009. Numerous other film programs and parallel conferences dedicated to international cinema and cineastes complimented these mentioned, as had become typical for FICM from its first years.

Above and beyond the afore-mentioned section México Imaginario, Mexico's representation in 2009, alongside all of the international hoopla, was at least as impressive as in previous years. Buzz focused heavily on three feature films that had premiered at TIFF just prior to FICM: Pedro González' drama/documentary hybrid Alamar (To the Sea, 2009), which ended up winning both Best Picture and the Audience Award at FICM; Rigoberto Perezcano's drama with a touch of dry wit Norteado (Northless, 2009); and the emotional and provocative documentary Presunto Culpable (Presumed Guilty) directed by Roberto Hernández and Geoffrey Smith (Hecht, "'Alamar'"). The documentary, which won Best Feature in its category at FICM, would go on to a controversial but very popular run in Mexican theaters—censored by the government and backed by Cinépolis acting as distributor, it would become the highest grossing documentary in Mexican cinema history in 2011. Mexican films screened in and out of competition, in special programs and in a number of tributes, including a retrospective dedicated to Dante Cerano, one of the most important indigenous filmmakers working at the turn of the 21st century (FICM, 7º Festival 110-14).

Also in 2009, the Women and Film and Television International branch in Mexico (most often abbreviated "WIFTI, Mexico")[96] raised their participation level in the FICM

[96] WIFTI is also known as Mujeres en el Cine y la Televisión, México, and in the latter case is abbreviated MCYTV.

festival. Beginning in 2007, WIFTI had offered "La Musa" ("The Muse") award to the top documentary by a woman at FICM. In 2009, WIFTI began to collaborate more extensively with the festival on a number of events and screenings to, in the words of WIFTI, Mexico's President Catherine Bloch, "highlight the presence of women working in film and television" (qtd. in 7º Festival 154). The honorees and films screened celebrated two women who worked in male-dominated fields in the early 20th century: the pioneering director Dorothy Arzner, who was one of few women who worked for the Hollywood studios as a director during the late 1920s through the early 1940s; and Adela "Perlita" Sequeyro Haro, who was a Mexican actor from the mid 1920s through 1950. Arzner was the first woman member of the Directors Guild of America, and although she retired from filmmaking, she went on to teach directing and screenwriting at UCLA. In addition to acting, Sequeyro wrote, directed, and produced a few films in the late 1930s, and her work was lost to obscurity until the 1990s when film festivals began to revisit it (7º Festival 155-58).

Before moving on to a discussion of Morelia Lab, this historical section will wrap with a discussion of the 2012 FICM, its tenth edition, as illustrative of recent trends under the continued direction of its founding team and the creative leadership of Michel. Leading up to the tenth annual festival, trades and newspapers consistently pointed to the strength of the program. For example, an article in El Economista, after pointing to how much the festival had grown in ten years, highlighted up front the Mexican film selections:

> This year in Morelia, one will enjoy a wide selection of films from all over the world, in addition to—of course—the exhibition of a good deal of Mexican film front and center, especially shorts (among which are films that may be chosen to represent Mexico in that category for the Oscars) but also documentaries and first feature narrative films. The selection of Mexican Feature Films includes

> exclusively first and second films, so it is offers a good lens through which to view what new filmmakers are doing. ("La década")[97]

The article went on to list a number of national and international films and guests that were planned for the 2012 FICM10. Film highlights included the opening night's No (2012) from the Chilean talent Pablo Larraín and starring Gael García Bernal, Paul Thomas Anderson's The Master (2012), David Cronenberg's Cosmopolis (2012), and Antonio Méndez Esparza's Cannes Critics' Week winning film Aquí y allá (Here and There, 2012). Guests such as acclaimed Iranian filmmaker Abbas Kiaorostami, celebrated British director Sally Potter, and esteemed Danish cineaste Thomas Vinterberg were named in anticipation of their presence to present films in Morelia. The publication wrapped by returning to the Mexican selection, indicating that those who missed what screened in Morelia would have the chance to view winning films at venues in Mexico City later in November after the festival had wrapped. Writing for The Hollywood Reporter and having covered the FICM over a few years prior to 2012, John Hecht pointed to many of the items featured in El Economista's preview, but added particular attention to two areas not really addressed specifically in the Mexican publication: some of the Mexican feature debuts, new films from established directors like Carlos Reygadas, Luis Mandoki, and Carlos Bolado; and an eye to the strength of the Mexican Documentary Features stating, "The official competition for the Mexican documentary section looks particularly strong this year with screenings from some of the nation's most talented filmmakers" (Hecht, "Pablo Larraín").

From these two articles in El Economista and Hollywood Reporter previewing the 2012 FICM, it seems as though Michel's vision of being the Mexican Film Festival "par excellence" was not too far off the mark. Being the 10th annual festival, the year also left

[97] Translated from original Spanish.

much room for reflection in many forms, including in a series of essays collected on FICM's web site under the heading Hacia los 10 años (Towards the 10th Year). Participants like film critics Fernanda Solórzano and Jean-Christophe Berjon, actor Cecilia Suárez, and others, contributed to the essay project, looking back on the reasons that they had come to love FICM over the years. They all essentially reflect the attitude expressly stated by the title of Suárez's contribution: "No me perdono no asistir al FICM," which translates as "I wouldn't forgive myself for not attending the FICM."

Outside of the FICM publication, other sources also look back on the festival's trajectory. In El Universal, an article ran the day before the 10th edition opened, and recalled that the first year of FICM, the festival only had two screens on which to present their selection, the opening night film's director did not attend, many screenings throughout the festival were not well attended, and a good deal of press left half-way through. The article contrasted this with expectations for the 2012 festival, which was likely to be more on par with the years leading up to it, in which tickets ran out right away, world cinema figures were in attendance, and press far outnumbered the space allotted to them ("Glamur"). For his part, in 2013, Nick James of Sight & Sound wrote a reflection of his experiences at the 2012 edition as well as a previous edition. He extolled what he experienced, and lamented that he did not get to see enough of the programming (high praise from someone of his stature in the film world). The logline of "A Collective Embrace" read "It's trimmed back the luxury—a bit—but this Mexican fest retains its uniquely pleasing balance of the social and the cinephile." James concluded his article in this manner:

> Morelia remains the very best I've experienced at creating that blend of the social and the cinephile. To be at a fairly intimate party where the major programmers of all the Cannes strands and the Berlin boss are present is rare indeed. But in Morelia anything seems possible, not least because the people who look after

> people work so incredibly hard. May it last many decades more. ("A Collective Embrace")

This was the environment that Michel stated that they had aimed to create through the FICM, and through which they established a different identity than that of FICG and GIFF. FICM remained anchored in supporting young Mexican filmmakers, especially in the competitions and screenings, which prioritized short films and first and second feature films. They brought in to Morelia some of the most important world cinema directors and artists, as noted throughout this chapter, to share their work and knowledge with Mexican filmmakers and cinephiles in an atmosphere that maintained a reputation of programming excellence, camaraderie, and artistic exchange. Michel described it as an academic environment, in the sense that FICM's goal is to provide programs that open filmmakers' eyes to the creative possibilities of the cinematic arts. However, it has also been important to the coordinating team that they keep their identity as a festival for Mexican films, filmmakers, and fans, and not a Market or Industry hub. According to Michel, in part this is because other festivals in Mexico have taken up that mantle; she stated that FICG's Market "is extraordinary and there is no need for two Markets." Additionally, because members of the industry have attended FICM because of what they have offered there as a panorama of Mexican film and world cinema, and that adding "Industry" accreditation did not fit their vision (Michel Interview).

The commitment of the FICM to creating a festival of tribute and celebration has been most visible to attendees including press through the "front of house" programming; however, it has also been evident to others who have attended and participated in parallel activities, such as Morelia Lab. As will be discussed below, FICM's approach to "industry" activities has to date been distinct from FICG and GIFF. In Variety, Young described it this way:

> The festival sees only a fraction of the industry participation of other festivals. But the quality-over-quantity is palpable [...]. As festival veep Cuauhtemoc Cardenas acknowledges, Morelia is about producers "seeing what's here, finding talent," not necessarily inking deals. ("Early Warnings")

With this in mind, the next section of this chapter explores the origin and history of the first years of Morelia Lab, before turning to case studies and further analysis related to the Lab, the FICM, and Mexican film production in the 21st century.

A Workshop for Producers: Morelia Lab

By all accounts, the first Morelia Lab, held in 2005, was overly ambitious, so much so that the first year resembles subsequent editions more in spirit than in realization. The spirit of the inaugural Morelia Lab emerged out of observations that there was a serious problem with filmmaking in Mexico, in particular that the lack of professional producers was contributing to both a lack of viable projects at the start, and an environment in which few people were equipped to know what to do with a good film idea in order to see it through to its realization (Taibo Interview). In particular, at IMCINE, a number of people had an eye on this problem, especially those in the areas of support for production and those in charge of administering funds. Funding programs including the Fondo de Inversión y Estímulos al Cine (Fund for Film Investment and Stimulation, or FIDECINE) and the Fondo para la Producción Cinematográfica de Calidad (Fund for the Production of Quality Films, or FOPROCINE) were available to filmmakers but many did not know to apply, and even if they did know, many lacked the skills not only to prepare a competent application package, but also the experience required to actually produce the film if funded (Ugalde Interview). At the time, Alfredo Joskowicz was the Director of IMCINE (tenure 2000-2006). Carlos Taibo held the position of Director of Production from early 2005 to mid 2007, and Víctor Ugalde was the Technical Director of FIDECINE from 2002-2009. According to Taibo, they and

others were in agreement with the assessment that few filmmakers in Mexico were really capable of producing a film successfully, in the true sense of rigorous development, attention to contracts, budgets, and the like (Taibo Interview).

When interviewed about the origins of Morelia Lab, Taibo said it originated for him with an attempt to address the question of how to find people suited to the vocation of being a producer, and then, correspondingly, how to best provide training and resources for their professional development (Taibo Interview). Ugalde also provided insight into his perspective and on IMCINE's role, stating that they had been working on supporting the film industry through the pitching programs, first at the IPM at the EEC in 2004, and then at the Encuentro at FICG in 2005, but they quickly realized something more was needed. As noted in Chapter 5, IMCINE was interested in working with the festivals because they had demonstrated the capacity to bring a lot of film industry members together in one place during their annual events. When discussing the progression of the IPM, then the Encuentro, then Morelia Lab, Ugalde described aspects of trial and error with initiatives:

> At the time, Guadalajara's pitch was international, and Guanajuato's national, and then we tried one in Mexico City which was a complete disaster, and so with Morelia, we said to ourselves, "we don't need another pitch because there aren't enough projects," as at the time there weren't all that many projects. So we decided what we needed to do was to train those who were working on projects. We thought about support at the script level, but it turned out what was most needed was training for producers, because funds were being wasted as producers learned on the fly. (Ugalde Interview)[98]

By the time Morelia Lab ran for the first time in the fall of 2005, the coordinators would not only be able to draw from input from the other two festivals' initiatives, but also their

[98] Translated from original Spanish.

own backgrounds and perspectives on what was needed to address the lack of professionally trained producers in the country.

For his part, Taibo's experiences prior to joining IMCINE afforded him a unique perspective from which to evaluate the state of Mexican film production at the time. In particular, he grew up with his father working in the industry; in an interview, Taibo noted that he was exposed to television production in his formative years. While he did begin studies at the university level in communications, he also began working in production, landing at a company that largely made institutional videos. Taibo eventually turned to full-time production work and left his formal studies, learning instead on the job. He faced a situation which he described as tough but ultimately inspirational for his later work:

> Everything with Morelia Lab has to do with the fact that when we started out, people didn't share information, they didn't want to teach others their tricks. I was lucky and met some people who were nice, and helped me out, but in general it was not common for anyone to explain their budget to you, or that someone would teach you how they did things so you could learn. They just wanted you to do your part without getting into theirs. (Taibo Interview)[99]

Then, in the early 2000s, Taibo was invited to teach at the CCC, to help a number of students who were finding it difficult to finish their thesis projects. During his time there, he set about trying to figure out how to systematically teach others what he knew. Since the idea of studying production as a degree track was not formally part of the academic culture, Taibo had to develop his own workshops based on his experience. This combination of working in both production and academic settings, neither of which were set up at the time to provide solid training for people who wanted to be producers, informed Taibo's experiences leading up to his appointment at IMCINE, and through into the development of Morelia Lab (Taibo Interview).

[99] Translated from original Spanish.

As the idea for a formal workshop for training producers gestated at IMCINE, a number of people and institutions got on board. Most notably, the directors of FICM agreed to partner formally with the project in two major ways: first, they agreed to host the final portion of the first Lab's activities in Morelia during the third FICM in 2005; second, Cinépolis stepped up to cosponsor with IMCINE awards at $50,000 MXP each, for the top two projects of the Lab (Taibo Interview; Quijano; Huerta, "Buscan"). From the first Morelia Lab through the time of this writing, Carlos Taibo and Andrea Stavenhagen have served as co-directors/co-coordinators. Stavenhagen, whose resume demonstrates commitment to film development and promotion, also had worked within IMCINE in the Short Film Production area in 1993 and 1994. From 1996 to 2002 she was Subdirector of Research and Outreach at the CCC,[100] and since the mid 2000s has been an integral leader in film festival industry-related activities especially at Guadalajara and Morelia, amongst other professional activities (EEC, Décimo 379).

With backing principally from IMCINE and FICM, Taibo and Stavenhagen developed the initial template for the Lab, and worked together to modify it through its subsequent iterations. As noted previously, Morelia Lab was conceived of by Lab principals Taibo and Stavenhagen, as well as the festival directors, as a parallel activity to the festival and explicitly not as an "Industry" area or "Market," in distinction to the organization of both GIFF and FICG. In an interview, Michel explained that FICM welcomed the Lab with open arms, and that it has been important to her and the other festival leads, as a compliment to their mission to support up-and-coming filmmakers. She added that an "Industry" area has different goals than those that FICM has, which Michel summed up as being a leading platform for exhibiting the best of Mexican and

[100] Andrea Stavenhagen held the post of "Subdirección de Investigación y Digulgación" at the CCC.

international cinema, and bringing together masters and first-timers for creative exchange (Michel Interview). Taibo explained it in complimentary fashion, stating, "We just wanted to surround the film producers, and surround all of us with high quality film. And we wanted, for a moment, to remove that external pressure that markets and industry areas at other festivals can signify" (Taibo Interview).[101]

The first edition of Morelia Lab included 40 projects and their representative producers (refer to Appendix Q), and was structured around three sets of workshops and seminars, running from October 1-15, 2005. The first two, "Production Today in Mexico and Iberoamerica" and "Independent Production in the United States," took place in Mexico City and were designed for all of the selected producers to attend. Then, a group of eight, chosen out of the original group of 40, were invited to Morelia for the third phase of the workshops/seminars entitled "Tools of Co-production with Europe," which was comprised of an intimate and intense few days of meeting, talking, and working on their projects with a team from Produire au Sud (FICM, Tercer Festival 202; Huerta, "Buscan"). From those eight, IMCINE and Cinépolis selected the two winners: David de la Peña with Instrumental from the Gremio de Cineastas de Nuevo León (the Filmmakers Guild of Nuevo León), and Araceli Velázquez with Hombre de una pieza from the University of Guadalajara ("Termina Morelia Lab"; V.O. Uribe). The first Morelia Lab was supported by a number of national and international participating institutions, indicating that from the beginning, important industry players recognized its potential: the CCC; the Centro Universitario de Estudios Cinematográficos (University Center for Cinematographic Studies, or CUEC); the University of Guadalajara (UDG); the Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes (The National Council for Culture and the Arts, or

[101] Translated from original Spanish.

CONACULTA); Sociedad General de Escritores de México (Mexican Writers Guild, or SOGEM); the Motion Picture Association regional office in Latin America, Argentina's Instituto Nacional de Cine y Artes Audiovisuales (National Institute of Film and Audiovisual Arts, or INCAA); and the aforementioned Produire au Sud program from the Festival des 3 Continents in France; just to name some of the major entities (FICM, Tercer 202).

With the second Morelia Lab in 2006, the coordinating team set a precedent of alternating documentary with narrative-themed years. During "even" years, the event was named Morelia Lab Doc, and convened producers who were working on documentary films. Odd years continued to invite producers representing narrative feature projects. A significant partner in support of reaching out to and funding filmmaker attendance, the Conferencia de Autoridades Audiovisuales y Cinematográficas de Iberoamérica (the Conference of Ibero-American Audiovisual and Film Authorities, or CAACI) came on board in 2006 and remained a supporter through 2009 (FICM, IV Festival 231; A. Stavenhagen, "Morelia Lab Doc"). The 2006 call was technically opened to Latin American producers, although it would not be until the Lab in 2007 that Latin American participation beyond Mexico would be in significant numbers. The 2006 Morelia Lab Doc also took place entirely during the FICM and in the city of Morelia, which would become the practice afterwards for the Labs. According to the FICM catalog, attendees participated in "an intense program including panels, round tables, the presentation of new initiatives supporting documentary film, and recent materials and footage by professionals in the field" (FICM, IV Festival 231). All activities were planned with the goal of specifically addressing the needs of and resources for documentary film producers, which often differ greatly from their narrative counterparts (Taibo Interview).

In essence, the design of Morelia Lab has been consistent since the third edition in 2007, which built upon the experiences learned in the first two, and each year has continued to inform the subsequent workshop and seminar structure of the Labs. Since 2007, the Lab has clearly taken under its wing the mentoring of filmmakers from all over Latin America, with the majority of participants still originating from Mexico. For example in 2007, according to the final report for the third Lab, thirteen participants representing thirteen Latin American countries joined eighteen participants from Mexico (Morelia Lab, "Morelia Lab 2007"). The prizes for two projects from the Lab have been split, with IMCINE's designated funds going to the development of Mexican projects, and Cinépolis' supporting Latin American films.

Also in 2007, the Lab's coordinators added a new activity to the general program, a training course in pitching projects and creating production portfolios, organized and facilitated by Martha Orozco, a long-time collaborator with Taibo and an accomplished producer herself. Particulars changed over the years, but pitching became a featured aspect of the Morelia Lab's activities. The general process was designed as a multi-step mentoring program, taking place over the course of the Lab. Early on in the activities, participants presented their projects; subsequently they attended lectures, workshops, or even intense exercises, where they have focused on improving their presentations. To wrap up the Lab's activities, the participants went through a final round of pitches in front of a professional panel or jury. In Taibo's estimation, "A producer who is incapable of transmitting an idea clearly is going to have a lot of trouble working unless he has a patron," and thus the focus on pitching was warranted (Taibo Interview).[102] The final

[102] Translated from original Spanish.

rounds of pitches were taken into account towards the prize determination through the timeframe covered by this study.

While the workshops and seminars have changed in terms of topics or featured panelists from year to year, overall they have consistently been organized to meet the core missions of the Lab. The fundamental founding principles of Morelia Lab, according to Taibo, were based on the idea that producers needed to be cultivated, and that their training needed systemization so that producers understood their responsibilities and were equipped to see projects through to completion (Taibo Interview). Over the years, the objectives have taken shape, and in 2013, they were formally articulated as follows:

- To support the training and professionalization of young film producers.
- To promote the dissemination of the films from the beginning of the film projects.
- To set up a support network, contact and cooperation between Latin American producers and directors and, in general, between film and audiovisual professionals.
- To foster, indirectly, and in the medium-term, the realization of projects presented at the workshop under good and efficient production schemes.
- To provide a positive collaborative experience among the participants in the framework of the celebration of FICM. (FICM, 11º Festival 233)

It is significant that all of the above objectives implicitly or explicitly focus on integrating producers into networks, starting with the infrastructure provided by the Lab's organizers and their experience, and moving outwards to other producers and professionals in the industry. In fact, in my estimation this is both Morelia Lab's biggest strength and its greatest difference from GIFF and FICG's Industry programs. During the Lab, activities are focused around both connecting producers with resources and demonstrating through experienced participants the value of the work of networking as a

career plan. In activities including GIFF's IPM and FICG's Encuentro, it has been my experience that the value of networking is taken for granted by the organizers, and generally by filmmakers with a few projects under their belts; by way of contrast, young producers have been prone to treating meetings that do not fairly quickly result in a finished film as a waste of time, at least in the short term. The film case studies in all three chapters of this research project illustrate the need for filmmakers to embrace the filmmaking process as one of networks and resources that must be built and sustained over many years, in order for projects such as these to reach completion. However, of the three festival initiatives, Morelia Lab has been the most dedicated to explicitly incorporating this ethos this into its multi-day set of activities.

As noted in previous chapters, GIFF and FICG organizers have created Industry activities and have brought together professionals across experience and specialty, knowing that only a fraction would find common interest on projects during the short timeframe of the festival and its activities. The fact that sometimes directors or producers leave disillusioned from the meetings at events, like the IPM or the Encuentro, has been seen as part of the process. However, Morelia Lab has consistently framed its activities within an environment that mentors its participants to take a long view of how the industry operates, providing perspectives from both newer and established filmmakers, thereby potentially mitigating the disillusionment that can happen when a young producer does not see quick progress on a project. This is invaluable if one is to see a film through completion, and even more so in order to establish a long-term career. Morelia Lab's principles and organization have reflected the approach of "thinking more about people than projects," as Taibo described it, by aiming to connect people to a network of other people all along the chain of support.

The way that Morelia Lab has integrated mission into practice will be illustrated by two case studies which comprise the next sections of this chapter. The purpose of referencing the production histories of Pastorela and Fecha de caducidad (Expiration Date) is to raise points for analysis with respect to how filmmakers have navigated production in Mexico in recent years, and evaluate ways that participation in film festival activities such as Morelia Lab formed a part of their professional formation. Environments such as the IPM or Encuentro de Coproducción have been conducive to networking by providing some structure and scheduled meetings between project representatives and industry representatives. By contrast, Morelia Lab has been especially geared towards facilitating connections between project representatives and potential mentors or role models, i.e. its scheduled events prioritize networking for long-term success, over securing a producing partner or sales agent or the like in the short term.

In each of the film case studies investigated, as with the IPM and Encuentro examples, the projects were first envisioned by a writer/director. When choosing which films to investigate from the Lab, I followed a similar pattern as before. I sought films helmed by Mexican creatives that were completed subsequent to participating in the Lab. Beyond this, I looked for films that were comparatively distinct in terms of narrative style and funding models. The more "classical" film in this instance is Pastorela, as its narrative was oriented towards reaching a popular audience; it was financed in part by FIDECINE and also by Mexico's Financial Stimulus for National Cinematic Production (Estímulo Fiscal a Proyectos de Inversión en la Producción Cinematográfica, or EFICINE, under the provision "Ley 226"). The funding awards from IMCINE were indications that the project was considered to have potential commercial appeal, which turned out to be accurate on its completion. The more experimental film of the two in this chapter is Fecha de caducidad, which was completed without IMCINE funds, has the

longest production history from script to screen of any project in this study, at over ten years. As the upcoming section details, the film was difficult to produce in large part because of its narrative form, extremely indebted to art cinema trends including elliptical story lines and unreliable narration—potential investors had a hard time understanding how or even if the script would translate to screen. I also chose Fecha because it was a female-helmed project, and it was important to me to include a little more diversity in this area.

As we turn to elaborate on the case studies, it is important to note a major difference between the film case studies from Guanajuato and Guadalajara and those from Morelia. While the directors were present at the IPM and the Encuentro, at Morelia Lab only the producers were in attendance at the activities. The interviews referenced in this chapter reflect this distinction. When I interviewed the films' representatives, I expected that, because the Lab was specifically designed and promoted as formational in nature, as opposed to as a business opportunity, that the producers would experience less of a disconnect between their expectations and identifiable results (as compared to the disillusion reported by the IPM and Encuentro filmmakers). This turned out to be the case. The producers applied to and attended Morelia Lab because they were in need of feedback on their projects, professional perspective, and industry connections, and they each identified such benefits from their participation. The next sections take a look at the case study histories of Pastorela and Fecha de caducidad, and then the chapter wraps with conclusions and analysis of Morelia Lab in the context of Mexican film production in the early 21st century.

Pastorela: Participant in Morelia Lab 2007

In 2007, the organizers of the third edition of Morelia Lab hosted a total of 31 invited producers to the workshop's activities. These producers each had a narrative feature in development, and represented 14 countries from Latin America; 18 of the 31 producers were from Mexico and the rest from other nations (refer to Appendix R for complete list of selected projects). Rodrigo Herranz was one of the selected producers. The project he applied to the Lab with was Pastorela. When completed, the film would represent his second narrative feature as producer, as well as the second feature for the writer/director Emilio Portes. Prior to wrapping and releasing Pastorela in 2011, Portes and Herranz would complete and release the feature comedy Conozca la cabeza de Juan Pérez (Meet the Head of Juan Pérez, 2008). The film Pastorela is also a comedy, and its central plot revolves around the staging of an annual Nativity play, one that is common in Mexican and Mexican-American communities, and historically known as the "Pastorela." Characters in the play "Pastorela" include the biblical figures of the Devil, the Archangel Michael, and the shepherds who search for the baby Jesus in the manger, among others. In the film Pastorela, a new parish priest rattles the established order when he changes up the casting of the play. As a result, the play's allegory of good versus evil blends with the reality of the staging of the play, as the priest and the townspeople, the latter often dressed in angel and devil costumes, duke it out over the fate of the play. While this may sound a little convoluted, the film is a broad comedy. Its narrative is accessible and linear, with clear stakes throughout and clear resolution of conflict.

As with many producers in Mexico of his generation, Herranz had studied for a different career. In fact, he graduated with a degree in Economics from the Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México (the Autonomous Technological Institute of Mexico, or ITAM) and worked professionally in the public sector for awhile. When interviewed

about his background, Herranz recalled that he had always been a fan of the cinema, and that in the back of his mind he had been interested in how films were made. Herranz realized that he was not cut out for a political career nor for the associated bureaucracy, and he began looking around for options to pursue another path. He applied to schools in the US, hoping to get into a master's degree program in film, but was quickly turned away since he did not have a film studies background. He was advised to first acquire some background in film studies before reapplying, so Herranz applied to the CCC twice, but did not get in. He decided then that he would just have to jump in and try to get hired on a production, and the first one he was hired on was a film for the CCC, one of the First Feature projects at the film school. The film was De ida y vuelta (To and Fro, 2000, Dir. Salvador Aguirre), and Herranz was brought on board as a production assistant. In the interview, he recalled that he worked with the production from late 1997 into early 1998; the team quickly realized that he was computer savvy, good with people, and good with communication, and so within a few weeks he was officially Production Coordinator for the project (Herranz Interview).

Through working on commercials and other film projects, Herranz made some important connections, and was hired to work on some relatively high-profile international coproductions that came to shoot in Mexico, in particular Renegade (2004, Dir. Jan Kounen) starring Vincent Cassel and Juliette Lewis. Through this production, Herranz established a working relationship with the founder and director of the company Ultra Films, Jean-Michel Lacor. Lacor was interested in reaching out to young Mexican directors, and around this same time, Herranz met both Lucía Gajá and Emilio Portes, who were both talented filmmakers from the CCC. Concurrently, Lacor and Herranz began working on developing two feature projects, Mi vida dentro (My Life Inside) a documentary by Gajá, and Conozca la cabeza de Juan Pérez by Portes. Lacor passed

away near the end of 2004, however, and as a result, Herranz found himself alone at the helm of the two films (Herranz Interview). Both would be completed, but it would take a few years; Mi vida dentro would be released in 2007 and Conozca la cabeza de Juan Pérez in 2008. Both also would bring acclaim to the filmmakers. Gaja's Mi vida dentro won the Jury Award for Best Documentary Film at the 2007 FICM, premiered in the US at Tribeca, enjoyed a tour on the international festival circuit and also a theatrical run in Mexico. Portes' comedy Conozca la cabeza de Juan Pérez bowed at FICG in 2008, winning best First Feature. It enjoyed a modest festival circuit tour, a national release, and went on to be nominated for six Arieles, winning four ("Mi vida dentro"; "Meet the Head"; Herranz Interview).

To return to 2007, just prior to the completion and release of Mi vida dentro and Conozca la cabeza de Juan Pérez, Portes and Herranz were working on Portes' second feature film, Pastorela. At the time of his participation in Morelia Lab in October of 2007, Herranz was preparing to start lining up financing for Pastorela. He was still very much a novice producer in a number of ways, especially when it came to feature films, learning on the job with Gajá and Portes (Herranz Interview). As part of the producer cohort of Morelia Lab 2007, Herranz was able to attend workshops including: the previously mentioned pitching exercises lead by Martha Orozco; a number of sessions with representatives from Produire au Sud on various topics related to coproducing with European partners, from intellectual copyright, development, contracts, and the like, through distribution and sales; a workshop with Mauricio Durán of Universal Pictures on Mexican Film distribution in Mexico; a workshop with a representative of Amazonia who spoke about how distribution works at the state level in Venezuela; and a few workshops with case studies of Mexican films and strategies for financing, distribution and sales in Mexico and Latin America. The pitching exercises opened the Lab and closed the Lab.

Furthermore, in between the first pitch and the closing pitch, the producers attended a general pitching workshop as a group, and each producer was able to work with Orozco one-on-one on his/her project in a private working session (Morelia Lab, "Morelia Lab 2007").

When asked in 2013 what aspects of attending Morelia Lab in 2007 have proven most valuable to him, Herranz pointed to two. The first item he noted was the classes and mentoring on pitching, and the second was the networking opportunities the Lab provided. In particular with respect to the pitching, Herranz said what he benefitted from was that it was a very focused kind of training: working with an individual project, and based on the kind of project one had, learning how to prepare materials that would help that project stand out from others. This training was not only geared towards pitching, or oral presentation, so that that would stick with a potential investor or partner, but also towards the creation of related ancillary materials like CDs or brochures that could go home with that person after the pitch. When reflecting on the experience, Herranz considered the set of skills learned in this training to have been the most important gain from his participation. With respect to the benefits of networking, he especially appreciated the connection to other working producers, and the ability to learn about them and from them. Herranz discussed learning about regional filmmaking in his own country, for example producer experiences in Coahuila, Monterrey, or Guadalajara, and also getting to know other professionals from Mexico City. Beyond that, connections to other Latin American filmmakers also opened his eyes to networks of resources, and other models for filmmaking and distribution beyond the Mexican and other North American systems with which he was already familiar (Herranz Interview).

After Morelia Lab, Herranz and Portes applied for funds from FIDECINE, which they were awarded; they then applied for funds through EFICINE, which was also

approved by IMCINE. This meant that they were able to move forward with production and subsequently editing, but they found themselves at the end of the year 2009 with the film in postproduction phase, in need of post, special effects, and processing on the way to printing the negatives. They were also out of funds. At this stage, Pastorela was selected to participate in the 2010 edition of Guadalajara Construye.[103] Few people attended the screening of the work in progress, which was disappointing. However, this would turn out to be less frustrating than another development that on the surface was at first good news: Pastorela won a number of the Guadalajara Construye awards, seven of the eight possible to be exact (Vega Zaragoza; Herranz Interview). As Herranz explained it, they were only able to use three of the seven awards:

> For example, there is a prize that was for thirty-five percent discount on a THX room, but what good is a discount if I don't have money? Then there was another prize that was forty hours of color correction, or a week, and you cannot color correct a film in a week. (Herranz Interview)[104]

He added that the process was also complicated by expiration dates on the prizes, so if they were not able to be used within a certain time period, they were gone.

In the end, despite all the challenges, the film did reach completion with some additional EFICINE funds and a number of postproduction providers working for reduced rates and/or for points on the film. Pastorela opened at FICM in 2011, then enjoyed a respectable box office run in Mexico (distributed by Videocine) but a weak one in the US (distributed by Pantelion Films, a division of Lionsgate). At the end of 2011 in Mexico, despite being released late in the year, November 11th, the film was fifth in

---

[103] The name Guadalajara Construye translates directly as "Guadalajara Constructs" however it is most common to refer to it in English by its Spanish name or as "Films in Progress." Guadalajara Construye first ran at FICG in 2007 and included nine projects from Latin America. Annually since then, Guadalajara Construye has included an elite selection of films in post-production that are in need of closing final financing and are seeking theatrical release.

[104] Translated from original Spanish.

overall box office for Mexican films at just over $3 million USD (México, IMCINE, Anuario 2011 32, 40). It won seven Mexican Ariels in 2012, including Best Film, Best Director, and Best Script. In the US, the film ran for three weeks in late 2011 with the widest release at fifty-five theaters, grossing just under $162,000 USD ["Pastorela (2011)"]. Although slated to play in the Vancouver Latin American Film Festival September of 2012, the film did not experience wide distribution through festivals. As of the time of this writing, Pastorela is currently available on DVD and Blu-ray from Pantelion/Lionsgate.

Fecha de caducidad (Expiration Date): Participant in Morelia Lab 2009

As the Morelia Lab's focus has alternated yearly between documentary and fiction film projects, the third Lab for fiction features took place in 2009, during the fifth iteration of Morelia Lab. The Lab hosted 32 producers from Mexico and other Latin American countries, with 11 countries represented in total (refer to Appendix S for complete list of selected projects). The project Fecha de caducidad (Expiration Date) was one of the 21 projects originating from Mexico, and producer Karla Uribe attended the Lab in representation of the film. By the time Uribe was working with the project at the Lab, she and the writer/director Kenya Márquez had already produced the first segment of the film as a short under the name "Señas particulares" ("Distinguishing Features," 2007). It would take another couple years after Morelia Lab 2009 to see the feature film through completion.

When reflecting on the journey of the film from concept in 2000, to festival premiere over ten years later at FICM in 2011, Márquez pointed to its tone: it is a black comedy and, due to its serious subject matter, she found it difficult to convey the humor of the film in the written word (Márquez Interview). The film centers around a mother's

investigation into the disappearance and death of her son, and the characters she meets while uncovering what she believes to be the truth. The first portion of the movie is presented from her point of view, after which time, the point of view changes to another character's, and then ultimately to a third character's, before wrapping up. Not all plot elements are revisited with each pass of the timeline, instead it becomes clearer during the latter portion of the film just how misguided the primary point of view had been about what had happened—while delving deeper as well into intertwined subplots. The unreliable narrator(s) as well as the elliptical structure of the narration are both heavily indebted to art cinema traditions. This would be difficult terrain for any filmmaker to navigate, and the result is challenging to viewers, requiring attention to a number of details that connect across the narrative threads. Fecha de caducidad does wrap with some resolution to questions raised, but otherwise leaves many unanswered.

As noted above, Márquez started working on the script in 2000. She had studied Communication at the Universidad del Valle de Atemajac (Atemajac Valley University, or UNIVA), and then later Screenwriting at the CCC. While at the CCC in the late 1990s, she directed some short films, and then in 2000 she began developing what would become Fecha de caducidad. She attended a workshop in Buenos Aires to work on the script and develop a pitch. Márquez then returned a few months later to the Buenos Aires Festival Internacional de Cine Independiente (Buenos Aires International Festival of Independent Film, or BAFICI) to present the pitch in a public forum in front of general attendees and jury members. She won an award of development funds sponsored by the Göteborg Film Festival; however, prior to advancing substantially on the film project, Márquez would first spend a few years as Director of FICG, from 2002 to 2005. After this, she returned to Fecha de caducidad and her collaborators and, since they were not gaining traction on producing the feature, Márquez proposed shooting the first ten

minutes of the script. By this time Márquez had brought on Uribe as producer. Uribe has also studied Communication at the UNIVA, and during much of the time she worked with Márquez, she was in the process of earning a Master's in Educational Technology from the UDG. Although she was not studying film, Uribe had started working on some small productions, and was excited about the opportunity to learn producing (Márquez Interview; K. Uribe Interview).

Márquez's idea to shoot the first pages of the script initially began as a proposal to create a trailer that could accompany the pitch, so that the style and tone of the film could come through. Furthermore, if successful, they could use that footage when shooting the feature, and reduce some of the costs down the line. When they got to the editing room with the footage, though, Márquez recalled that the editor convinced her that it could be edited as a short film (Márquez Interview). They applied to IMCINE for funds to finish the short, which they were awarded, and which they used on postproduction of "Señas particulares." Both Uribe and Márquez stated in interviews that they were pleased with the results, that they could see from the short that the greater idea could work (K. Uribe Interview), and that they could create the atmosphere, humor, characters, and concepts in the manner that Márquez envisioned it (Márquez Interview). On top of this, "Señas particulares" was well received on the festival circuit, and was nominated for the 2008 Ariel Award for Best Short Fiction Film.

Uribe recalled that she and Márquez were really happy with the buzz that the short film generated, and that they were thinking that this would help get the feature project moving forward. Ultimately, though, it continued to prove challenging to raise funds (K. Uribe Interview). Based on her experiences, including her stint as Director of FICG, Márquez believed in the value of applying broadly to funds and festival initiatives. As part of those strategies with respect to Fecha de caducidad, she decided they needed to

apply to Morelia Lab (Márquez Interview). As producer, Uribe submitted an application and was selected to attend in 2009. As in previous years, the Lab was focused heavily on training in project packaging and pitching, led by Orozco. Orozco was joined in 2009 by special invitee Samuel Chauvin, a French producer whose participation was sponsored by Kodak Mexico (Morelia Lab, "Morelia Lab 2009"). Other activities included panels on topics such as funds for film production in Mexico, led by Víctor Ugalde in representation of the Mexican Directors Guild; an overview of European markets and funds available to Latin American productions, led by Marten Rabarts of Binger Filmlab; case study presentations by Mexican producer Edgar San Juan of two completed feature films; and a round table discussion on producing films in Latin America, with producers Chauvin of 13 Production, Geminiano Pineda of Canana Films, Laura Imperiale of Cacerola Films, and Sandro Halphen of Goliat Films (Morelia Lab, "Morelia Lab 2009").

When reflecting on the experience, Uribe identified two major aspects that stood out to her. The first benefit was the process of learning how to pitch the project, while having access to experts in their fields to help mentor along the way. Uribe was especially receptive to this process, stating that prior to the Lab she had been working on a lot of things, and doing them the way she thought they should be done, but without the experience. She stated, "There are experts at the Lab, and they made me discover how important it is to identify immediately the merits of producing the film, in order to sell it, to seek financing, to convince others, including how to put together a presentation" (K. Uribe Interview).[105] She also pointed to how important it was to her that there were international producers in addition to the Mexican producers present. The second take-away was also related to access and networking, specifically hearing from other

[105] Translated from original Spanish.

producers about their experiences, and beginning to get a bigger picture of what it really would mean to see a feature film project through to realization and distribution. She mentioned that she learned specific information, for example a moment stood out to her when a producer of Lake Tahoe (2008, Dir. Fernando Eimbcke) shared how working with an investor through EFICINE had helped them in terms of pulling film financing together (K. Uribe Interview).

More generally, Uribe noted in an interview, through the Lab she started to absorb how difficult the process could be, and how long it could take, although she commented that this lesson did not sink in entirely until she had experienced it for herself. Uribe held the belief it would not be quite so challenging for her and Márquez, as it had been for the producers sharing their experiences during the Lab, but it turned out that it would be (K. Uribe Interview). Having a point of reference that they were not alone in the experience was helpful in seeing it through; Uribe stated, "It is quite complicated, and I'm telling you, it is a light along the way to know that someone else has gone through it, that they've gone down that road, and pulled it off" (K. Uribe Interview).[106]

As mentioned above, it would still take some time after the 2009 Morelia Lab until Fecha de caducidad was completed. In fact, it would take almost exactly two years. The film debuted at the 9th FICM in 2011, and Márquez noted that they completed and printed the film a week or so prior to the screening (Márquez Interview). It came together as a production of Puerco Rosa Producciones, with support from the Secretaries of Tourism and Economic Development for the State of Jalisco, the Municipal Government of Guadalajara, the UDG, and a post-production award from the Göteborg International Film Festival Fund ("Ficha Técnica"; Márquez Interview). As difficult as it had been to

[106] Translated from original Spanish.

bring the script to the screen, the response was immediately positive on a number of levels. Fecha de caducidad won the Audience Award at the FICM9 in 2011, as well as a special mention from the Jury; it went on to win awards in 2012 including at Miami Film Festival for Best Ibero-American First Feature, at Huelva Latin American Film Festival for Best Director, and another special mention from the Jury at the Moscow International Film Festival ("Fecha de caducidad").

Critical praise was also high, including by Mexican reviewer César Huerta, who called it "La nueva joya del cine nacional" ("The new jewel of national cinema") in an article by the same name. In that article, Huerta referenced a celebratory review by Howard Feinstein in ScreenDaily; in the original article, Feinstein stated, "[Márquez] equals or even tops any of the earlier more renowned filmmakers who directed fine black comedies: Carlos Carrera, Arturo Ripstein, and, yes, even Luis Bunuel [sic] during his Mexican filmmaking years." As laudatory as Feinstein's praise was throughout the article, he also nodded to the difficulty of breaching international markets: "The film should get relatively wide exposure, assuming it breaks out" ("Expiration Date"). Unfortunately, this has not been the case to date. Even with the backing of Latinofusión and Alfredo Calvino as sales agent, the film has seen weak box office and little international crossover. IMCINE reports a Mexican theatrical run in late 2013, with 30 prints on 30 screens, and revenue of $1,341,371 MXP (México, IMCINE, Anuario 2013 50). At the time of this writing, the film is available on Amazon on DVD but only in Region 4 encoding. That said, given its production timeline and critical reception, the film can be considered successful in that it was completed after over ten years, and met high praise in certain circuits.

CONCLUSIONS, FICM AND MORELIA LAB 2005-2011

As with previous chapters, this one now turns to analysis and discussion of early editions of Morelia Lab. The interviews above provide interesting perspectives, in that they reveal a mindset on the part of the filmmakers as to why the producers would apply to participate, as well as what they hoped to achieve through attending the Lab, which is distinct from the earlier chapters' findings. Parallel to the case study projects whose representatives attended the IPM and the Encuentro, the case study projects whose producers attended the Lab were at a crucial point in the project's life-span. In all six cases, the attendees were looking for resources that would help move a specific project forward. In particular, the IPM and Encuentro attendees interviewed identified that they were in need of co-producers who could help with financing, and they applied to and attended the events with this primary goal in mind. The Lab attendees interviewed reported applying for an additional reason: the producers were new to the craft and knew it, and they were looking forward to learning from the experiences of others.

For his part, Herranz was working on his first feature films as lead producer, having lost an established producing partner in Lacor, while producer Uribe was working on her first feature as producer and was learning day-to-day through the experience (Herranz Interview; K. Uribe Interview). In other words, based on their interviews, Herranz and Uribe evidently both approached going into the Lab with an attitude of being there to learn and network, and not necessarily to walk away with a deal. Notably, Abril Schmucler, who was interviewed by this author as a representative of Vaho (Becloud, 2009, Dir. Alejandro Gerber Bicecci) for the 2007 FICG Encuentro case study, also attended Morelia Lab in 2005 with the project Mundo nuevo. Schmucler reported that she applied to and attended the Lab in 2005 with the attitude of learning as much about producing as possible, as she was finding it difficult to learn through her other resources.

In fact, she applied with that project not because it was her top priority to produce it, but because she needed a project to apply with in order to be able to attend the Lab, and have something to work on while there (Schmucler Interview). While the reasoning and associated approaches taken by Herranz, Uribe, and Schmucler are not universally applicable to the Lab participants, when considered together, their attitudes about attending the Lab are comparable. They are also distinct from other attitudes as expressed by IPM and Encuentro interviewees about their reasons for participating in the activities at EEC/GIFF or FICG, including as communicated by Schmucler herself when she discussed why she and Alejandro Gerber Bicecci attended the Encuentro. The Lab was contextualized as formational; the IPM and Encuentro as deal-oriented.

With this in mind, we consider the data in Table 5. As with previous tables, Table 5 illustrates the long odds that the select group of participating Lab producers faced when working on feature narrative projects. It is revealing first and foremost in the especially large gap between the numbers of Mexican narrative projects that were represented at the 2005-2011 Labs, and projects that have actually been completed by end of 2013. If we consider films that participated in the Lab, that signed up as Mexican projects and/or were completed with Mexican producers, as of 2013, only 10 projects out of 98 fitting the criteria of this investigation were reported as completed—a number representing just over 10% of the projects. This is a completion rate much lower than either IPM or the Encuentro. Per Table 3 in Chapter 4, the IPM projects' completion rate for this timeframe was calculated at just over 27%, and per Table 4 in Chapter 5, the Encuentro projects' completion rate was calculated at just over 38%.

Year	No. Mexican projects (prod or co-prod)	No. completed by end of 2013	No. with festival screening(s)	No. released Mexico	No. with international release
2005	40	5	5	5	1
2007	19	3	3	2	3
2009	22	2	2	1	0
2011	17	0	0	0	0

Table 5: Overview of Mexican Projects' Status from Morelia Lab, 2005-2011[107]

The nature of the Lab as one explicitly geared towards mentoring, based on both coordinators' descriptions and the interviewed participants' input, could be correlated to the low completion rate of projects. Preliminary investigation points in that direction, and future research would be helpful in providing more insight.

Although other aspects of the Lab may differ from the Encuentro, one finding in common between the two was that the Lab also appears to have served to connect producers from other countries to Mexican co-producers. As noted in Chapter 5, the project Agua fría de mar (Cold Water of the Sea, 2010, Dir. Paz Fábrega) was registered in 2008 for the IV Encuentro as a Costa Rica production. Prior to that, Paz Fábrega had attended the 2007 Morelia Lab with the project; ultimately the film was completed as a Costa Rica/France/Spain/The Netherlands/Mexico coproduction. The narrative of that production history could be quite illuminating since the project went through both the Lab and then the FICG Encuentro. Another project of note from the 2007 Lab is Carga Sellada by the Bolivian director Julia Vargas-Weise and producing partner Pilar Valverde. At the 2007 Morelia Lab, Valverde represented the film, then listed as a Bolivian project. Although Carga Sellada did not yet make the list of completed films in Table 5, as of late 2015, the film was listed online as "in production" by the Mexican-

[107] Data compiled from IMCINE databases and publications; IMDb Pro data; last updated end of year 2013. The above includes only narrative features that participated in Morelia Lab, that signed up as Mexican projects and/or that listed Mexican producers or coproducers upon completion.

based company Arte Mecánica with producer Ozcar Ramírez attached ("Carga Sellada | En Producción"). Finally, in 2009, Gustavo Fallas represented the film Puerto Padre (Port Father), registered as a Costa Rican project. The film was subsequently completed in 2013, with Fallas as director, as a coproduction between Costa Rica and Mexico, and its Mexican premiere was at FICG29 in 2013 (Morelia Lab, "Morelia Lab 2007"; "Morelia Lab 2009"; FICG, FICG29 Catalog 87). These projects' outcomes indicate that the Lab may have facilitated connections that resulted in business opportunities for Mexican companies as coproducers on Latin American projects. While this would need to be investigated further, it is an interesting possible outcome of inviting the projects to Mexico to participate in the Lab.

The process of investigating Morelia Lab has solidly underscored that the Lab has been oriented towards skill-building in the short-term, as opposed to deal-making. It also highlighted what can happen if you look only at completion rate of participating projects as opposed to other more holistic views of success. For example, Herranz participated in the Lab with Pastorela, but took skills with him towards completing two other features in the short term, as well as for other films on which he would subsequently work. Schmucler participated with a film that she did not end up producing, but she went on to produce other works of international acclaim including Vaho and No quiero dormir sola (She Doesn't Want to Sleep Alone, 2012, Dir. Natalia Beristáin).

An additional case study that could be illuminating along these lines would be that of producer Edher Campos of Machete Producciones. In 2009, Campos attended Morelia Lab with the project La habitación (The Room), an anthology piece with multiple directors that took a good deal of time to come together (Morelia Lab, "Morela Lab 2009"). The film also went through the IPM in 2011, and a few years after that would be in post-production (GIFF Festival 2011 296). Despite the fact that at the time of

this writing the film La habitación is not yet completed, Campos has built a reputation as a leading producer recognized in Mexico and in international art cinema circuits. In 2009, after attending Morelia Lab in October, Campos attended Ventana Sur in Buenos Aires in December. While in Argentina, he inked a deal with Pyramide Intl. for director Michael Rowe's film Año bisiesto (Leap Year, 2010), a film that would go on to win the Camera d'Or at Cannes in 2010. In 2011, Variety quoted Campos as saying, "Morelia's Lab gave me the necessary tools as a producer to face the challenge of presenting 'Leap Year' to distributors and agents at Ventana Sur's (rough-cut) Primer Corte showcase" (qtd. in Young, "Early Warnings"). Another film that Campos co-produced, La jaula de oro (The Golden Dream, 2013, Dir. Diego Quemada-Díez) made a splash at Cannes' Un Certain Regard and elsewhere, including all but sweeping the Mexican Ariel Awards in 2013. Based on these examples, to judge Morelia Lab's "success" by participating projects alone runs the risk of ignoring other results or accomplishments less obviously or directly linked to the Lab, but which stem from a producer's participation.

The same argument could be made by extension about participants in the IPM or Encuentro—as evidenced by the nature of film industries, not all projects in any pipeline to production will get made. Although both the IPM and Encuentro are focused on deal-making in the shorter term in an explicit manner, the implicit added benefit of network building should be evaluated as capacity building; some of the forums or other parallel activities at both Guanajuato and Guadalajara also overtly point to efforts to provide spaces that foster knowledge and network bases and should be evaluated on those terms. While one project may be foregrounded by its participation in any given program, the person or people behind that project are likely involved in a number of projects (illustrated in this chapter by producer Herranz's experiences) and/or other professional endeavors (illustrated in this chapter by both director Márquez's and producer Uribe's

accounts). Success of any festival initiative, then, would best be evaluated not only in how it provides platforms for completion of selected films, as discussed in previous chapters, but in how it adapts and adjusts to try to provide the best experience for the people involved in terms of career building.

Morelia Lab appears most suited to this type of analysis, as its iterations have incorporated identifiable fine-tuning, not only in adding a pitching mentoring program to the schedule, or adjusting roundtables yearly, but also for other initiatives. For example, in 2011 the coordinators convened a special edition for producers working on their second features (Morelia Lab, Morelia Lab 10 Años 59). Even the splitting of years between narrative and documentary is pedagogical in nature, and aimed at serving best the attendees with the time allotted. As Taibo explained it:

> It is very clear to us that there is a distinction between producing a documentary and a fiction film. Really clear, and that is why we separated them. It is because we did not have time in the same year to invite producers of fiction films and documentary producers. We had to separate them and I believe it has been useful. We have been missing a third section for producers of animated films, but we just do not have time. (Taibo Interview).[108]

I include the final sentence in the above quote because by introducing a third possible producing facet to selection, Taibo illustrated in a compelling way the careful nature of the project selection and design of the Lab program by year. Morelia Lab was created for producers, but also anchored to the idea that it existed to convene producers who could meet on some common ground while participating in the activities, learning from other producers and industry members interested in supporting their professionalization.

In a publication that looked back over the ten years of Morelia Lab from 2005 through 2014, introductory contributions included remarks by FICM Director Daniela

[108] Translated from original Spanish.

Michel, and representatives of IMCINE.[109] In her reflection, Michel foregrounds the interconnectedness of the respective success of FICM and Morelia Lab:

> Thanks to the renewed stream of young producers that enthusiastically responded to Morelia Lab's annual calls for entries, professionals (participating producers and invited experts) attend the Festival, injecting energy, exchanging experience, and promoting dialog and debate in the Lab's sessions. With dedication and generosity, many special guests that FICM has welcomed over the years have agreed to share their experiences with the youth at the workshops. (Untitled Introduction 7)[110]

As noted in the festival history of this chapter, FICM had some advantages going into its first years that EEC/GIFF and the Muestra/FICG did not when they got started, including that Michel was already quite connected in the film community at the level of film exhibition, and in particular had years of curatorial experience with the Jornada of Mexican Short films that translated directly into the first FICM's program. With her connections along with the other founding members' resources, FICM was able to establish relationships with other organizations at top levels of the film industry early in its history; as noted previously, these included partnering with Cannes and the International Critics' Week from its very first year, and official recognition from the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences of the United States by its sixth year, to just name a couple. World-class guests also have been the standard from the beginning. These factors may give the impression that the festival was destined to succeed.

However, we must remember that FICM was founded with a mission to support Mexican film at a time when feature film production was in crisis, and there were already two other major festivals in Mexico that had the attention of the national and international film communities. The perceptions that the Muestra in Guadalajara was veering from its

---

[109] I was invited to contribute an introductory reflection to this volume, and my commentary accompanies those by IMCINE, FICM, and Morelia Lab representatives.
[110] Translated from original Spanish.

initial mission, and that EEC was really only about short films (and was more international), did allow a space for FICM to brand itself as the venue for Mexican films at the time, even if there were not many features to exhibit. Another calculated step was to focus on young filmmakers, of course through the shorts film programs, but also by explicitly going after premieres of Mexican first or second features and making a big deal of every screening (Ugalde Interview). Michel and team took risks with this plan, from the beginning and also as, very quickly after FICM's first year, Mexico as a nation would begin to experience the film festival explosion that was happening elsewhere in the world. Getting ahead and staying ahead of the curve would continue to be an issue not just for FICM, but for all of the festivals profiled in this project.

Industry events "behind the screens" have been a way that the festivals FICG, GIFF, and FICM have enhanced their ability to stay relevant on the festival circuit. In the case of FICM and Morelia Lab we might consider their relationship as a "partnership" or "collaboration" due how the Lab was conceived and co-directed in parallel with festival direction; nonetheless, Michel has consistently affirmed that, from its first edition, "the Lab has imparted additional value to the Festival's objectives and activities" (Untitled Introduction 7). If developed and implemented successfully, industry initiatives can generate new relationships between the festival and artists, inspire collaborations between attendees (i.e. foster new art), and transform a festival's identity within the industry from exhibitor to a field-configuring event where new artists and new ideas can be discovered. This seems to have been the case for Morelia Lab, which started out and stuck with the clear vision of being a training ground for producers. In the 10-year memoir, Morelia Lab co-directors Stavenhagen and Taibo's statement pointed to past goals: "Why exclusive to producers? We wanted to help consolidate the idea of the creative producer, responsible for the execution, but also for the content. Careful about choosing the script and the

director, responsible not only for completing the film, but also seeing that it reaches audiences" (Stavenhagen and Taibo 12).[111] Stavenhagen and Taibo then highlighted what they considered their accomplishments, stating, "Morelia Lab celebrates a decade of meticulous selection of projects and speakers, hours of case studies, and, without a doubt, the best and most intense training for pitching, which has been perfected through our different editions" (12).[112] After a few more comments, thanks to major supporters, and expressing hope that the publication will serve as a record of the past and inspiration for the future, they closed in bold case with "Thank you IMCINE and FICM. Now, to reinvent ourselves" (13).[113]

With these remarks, which point to continued hope for the future of Mexican and other Ibero-American films and filmmakers, we conclude this chapter. The next section of this project provides final remarks about all of the festivals, their initiatives, and the changing landscape of Mexican film production over the past fifteen to twenty years.

[111] Translated from original Spanish.
[112] Translated from original Spanish.
[113] Translated from original Spanish.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

This project's inquiries bridge contemporary media industry studies, Mexican film history, and film festival studies, the intersection of which provides for significant contributions to each field and together illustrate the need for more in-depth research and analysis in these areas. The scholarly study of film festivals is a recent phenomenon, especially in terms of documenting and analyzing the roles they play as media outlets and industry agents in local, regional, and global circuits. Notably, within film history and film festival study, Mexico, its cinematic production, and its film industry institutions traditionally have been marginalized, particularly in English-language scholarship. Add to this that film festival scholarship to date has primarily focused on issues related to festival impact in curatorial and exhibition terms, an area in need of more attention is the burgeoning trend by film festivals to explicitly engage with and support films and filmmakers with works in development. As illustrated by the Guadalajara International Film Festival (FICG, Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara), the Guanajuato International Film Festival (GIFF), and the Morelia International Film Festival (FICM, Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia), when festivals take on such responsibilities within the culture industries, the results can be significant. For this study, the focus has been on how their festival initiatives have shaped the field of film production within the Mexican national cinematic landscape. This represents the first systematic study of this new development not only in Mexican film, but beyond.

When reflecting on the growth of Mexican cinema in recent years, and in particular on the dramatic rise of national film production beginning in the early 2000s, the numbers are impressive. A film industry that in the late 1990s was in crisis, by 2005 would see more than 50 features produced each year for the next few years. From 2012 to

the time of this writing, the number has annually exceeded 100. Looking at these numbers can serve as a validation of efforts on many fronts to reinvigorate Mexico's film industry, and as inspiration to the next generation of filmmakers who presently have a variety of role models to look to on national and international stages.

As this project has demonstrated, the raw production numbers needed not only to be celebrated, but also to be understood, contextualized, and evaluated in order to assess at the least three fundamental questions. First, what factors likely contributed to the industrial turn-around? Second, what lessons could be learned that could be applied to future sustainability and invigoration? And third, what other areas have yet to be addressed? The factors that I most focused on for this study, and which contributed to the turn-around, were those based in the public sectors: government stimulus funding and film festival initiatives, both aimed at supporting producers and films in production. Major lessons that come out of the study are that a multi-pronged approach to supporting and developing professional producers, including emphasis on the importance of building mature industry networks, are key components for sustained revitalization of the industry. Finally, the area that continues to cause greatest frustration for Mexican cineastes is nothing new: mainstream exhibition and distribution networks marginalize Mexican content in favor of Hollywood. Festival screens—both domestic and internationally—remain valuable resources for national productions to reach audiences, but such screenings do not typically return substantial if any direct investment to producers, and financial return is key to any sort of long-term industrial endeavor. These are all important considerations as we conclude this current project and set the stage for further inquiry.

Festivals such as those at the heart of this study, FICG, GIFF, and FICM, occupy a space in the national film industry landscape relative to other institutions, that is

comprised of both complimentary and competitive relationships. Historically, as part of their missions, each was dedicated to exhibiting national films and promoting national filmmakers through screenings. This made them stakeholders in the success of Mexican film as a component of their own success as festivals; it also made them aware of how scarce resources were and how important it was for them to stay ahead of the curve. From their vantage points, as they pulled their programs together annually, festival leadership had the ability to assess the state of the industry. In the late 1990s and early 2000s, with the Mexican industry in crisis, the festivals had choices to make in order to survive and remain relevant. Through "front of house" activities—screenings, guests, and other program events—the festivals each demonstrated that they could provide screen time for national films, attracting audiences, and drawing press to those screenings. There just was not very much by way of national film production to program, especially at the level of Mexican narrative feature films.

Even in this environment, by 2004 or 2005 each festival had anchored itself in the circuit as a "must-attend" event for at least regional audiences, national and international press, and some international attendees. Their prominence was due in part to their being early leaders nationally in establishing regional festivals; as discussed in Chapter 5, when FICM launched in 2003, the only other majors on the festival scene were FICG and EEC. That would change. However in 2004 and 2005, these three festivals were the significant players as recognized by members of the Instituto Mexicano de la Cinematografía (the Mexican Cinematographic Institute, or IMCINE), and they remain important collaborators with IMCINE through the time of this writing (e.g. Mexico, IMCINE, Anuario 2014 4). All four entities, the festivals and IMCINE, were struggling with the question of what to do to promote more film productions in the country. There was not an easy answer, but Ragan Rhyne's understanding of how such stakeholders' interests are

interrelated and managed applies to my analysis here of the Mexican context. Rhyne's observation is that film festivals are important sites of negotiation, where artistic and commercial interests between the non-profit and market sectors may be managed in a way that reduces risk on the part of government and corporations (20-21). Especially in the case of Mexico in the late 1990s/early 2000s, if we think in particular in terms of capital risk, neither the government nor private interests were backing Mexican films in substantial numbers (refer to Table 1). This was in part because networks for project ideas to connect with funders (whether public or private) were not yet in place, and, by extension, in part because financiers' perceived risk for loss was high considering how few professional producers were actually active in Mexico at the time.

By the early 2000s, funds including Fondo para la Producción Cinematográfica de Calidad (Fund for the Production of Quality Films, or FOPROCINE), the Fondo de Inversión y Estímulos al Cine (Fund for Film Investment and Stimulation, or FIDECINE), and the Estímulo Fiscal a la Producción Cinematográfica Nacional (Financial Stimulus for National Cinematic Production, or EFICINE)[114] were available to filmmakers. Film and cultural institutions including IMCINE were interested in finding projects to fund to address the crisis in national film production, but again the networks were not strong. In many ways, the Mexican film industry was still trying to recover from the insularity that had dominated the film industry for decades, in terms of funding through a central film bank, and training through tightly restricted connections like apprenticeships and guilds. Once IMCINE had funds to administer, the question of how best to find viable projects was one that they decided to address through outreach

[114] FOPROCINE (Fund for the Production of Quality Films) was established in 1998 has been most active since 2001. FIDECINE (Fund for Film Investment and Stimulation) has been active since 2001/2002.

EFICINE (Financial Stimulus for National Cinematic Production) has been active since 2006. EFICINE was also referred to as "Efficient 226," and initially it was commonly referred to as "Ley 226" (Law 226) or "Artículo 226" (Article 226), referring to its original place in Mexican tax code and law.

programs, including partnerships with festivals. The festivals themselves were looking at the problem from different vantage points; they identified that filmmakers needed to not only be connected with government financial options, but specifically other people who could help. Assistance could take the form of capital or experience or both, but the idea was that with the right kinds of connections, more films could be made.

To more actively influence the conversation and impact the direction of Mexican film production, the festivals each made particular moves that can be understood as a form of vertical integration. In business models, including in the contemporary conglomerate scene that dominates Hollywood's major studios as discussed in Chapter 3, vertical integration describes the method through which businesses diversify their divisions, in order to control intellectual rights and revenue interests from a product's concept through market exploitation (ref. Schatz, "Film Industry Studies"). Film festivals as exhibitors typically engage with films at one end of the creative process: the curation and screening of completed films. They may serve as launching pads for future exhibition or distribution of the films they program, but they have not traditionally had distribution arms themselves. Furthermore, festivals as exhibitors have historically tapped into and been influential in art cinema circuits. If we think in business terms, the "behind the screens" or "industry" activities investigated in-depth for this project—the International Pitching Market (IPM) in Guanajuato at Expresión en Corto (EEC),[115] the Encuentro de Coproducción in Guadalajara at FICG,[116] and Morelia Lab during FICM—represent concrete activities through which each festival diversified its divisions. In essence, these

[115] The festival name "Expresión en Corto" is not traditionally translated into English. See chapter 4, note 29. Since 2011, the festival has changed names. As of the time of this writing, it has rebranded itself officially the Guanajuato International Film Festival (GIFF), with its non-profit branch still named Expresión en Corto.

[116] In English, translated as Ibero-American Coproduction Meeting, however it is still most common for industry professionals to refer to it in the original Spanish name of "Encuentro de Coproducción," or "Encuentro" for short.

initiatives provided platforms through which the festivals would be connected not only with completed films and their representatives, but also with filmmakers with projects at creative stages. This meant that they created the potential to be influential along more of films' life cycles than previously was the case.

The architects of the festival initiatives designed their particular "divisions," giving them names imbued with branding, identities, and missions—a Pitching Market, an Encuentro de Coproducción / Coproduction Meeting, and a Lab. As noted throughout this project, a unifying goal across the three festivals and these activities or divisions was that of increasing Mexican film production. By extension, each activity and its coordinators were part of a larger national conversation as to what it would take to reach that goal. Mexican festivals moving into such activities addressed interests for at least four types of stakeholders in Mexican national film production. The festivals' initiatives also bridged what are often uneasy gaps between art cinema and commercial sectors, because their interests were not only in promoting art cinema production, but national cinema production as a whole. The primary stakeholders were the festivals themselves, but they brought to bear three others: (1) IMCINE, (2) film industry professionals including producers, distributors, and sales agents, and (3) filmmakers with projects. I mention these stakeholders in particular because they were the most directly involved in the IPM, Encuentro, and the Lab, and also because it provides a lens through to analyze the festivals as field-configuring events and institutions.

To return to the issues noted above, when they created these initiatives, or others within their festivals' operations, FICG, EEC, and FICM did so in reaction to the state of the Mexican film industry. In their own ways, each festival aimed to tackle the Mexican film industry's insularity in funding and training. Their responses took the form of create networking opportunities and professionalization activities to address the identified

funding and training issues. Of networking and professionalization, the first was prioritized initially, as both the IPM and the Encuentro launched activities that focused specifically on connecting Mexican projects with industry professionals. Even the Mercado de Cine Iberoamericano en Guadalajara / Guadalajara Film Market, which predated the Encuentro at FICG, can be contextualized as part of the festival's coordinators initially favoring a networking strategy. The IPM and the Encuentro were not executed without regard to the fact that Mexican film representatives were not really trained in pitching and packaging, but rather they were implemented with an eye towards trying to initiate movement in a stagnant film production sector by disrupting its insular traditions.

As Víctor Ugalde described it, and as resonated with other first-hand accounts, the festivals were ideally positioned to bring everyone and everything together; much less time was needed to schedule many meetings between various parties since so many of them were in one place already (Ugalde Interview). Filmmakers interviewed for the project also perceived this as a benefit. Specifically, participation in a festival initiative provided one place where they could connect with many potential collaborators, the majority of whom would otherwise have been unavailable for them to meet with. For project representatives, because of how closed the Mexican film industry loops were, this applied just about as equally for connecting them with national film networks and industry representatives as it did for international. Admittedly, a perspective that was not explored for this project was that of the film industry professionals who attended, and further analysis would definitely benefit from adding this area of inquiry to the research. Another important area that deserves attention is how filmmakers from countries other than Mexico perceived their participation in the IPM, Encuentro, and/or Lab. This project

has remained purposefully Mexican-centric, but there is a great deal to learned by expanding the interview and data collection pools.

That said, at this time, plenty can be learned by applying theories about field configuration to what was learned through the present research. To return to the two questions of networking and professionalization at the IPM, Encuentro, and Morelia Lab, the pervasiveness and depth of weakness in the latter area within the Mexican film industry was revealed to participants and organizers through the execution of the first two IPMs in the summers of 2004 and 2005, and the first Encuentro in the spring of 2005. Those events had prioritized networking. This leads to the first application of field theory, and the term "field-configuring events" in a sense that resonates with Charles-Clemens Rüling's research on the Annecy International Animated Film Festival and Market. It takes awhile for change to occur in any field, and field-configuring events are those that attract the field's major players to them, and through their execution allow for invested participants to assess the state of the industry, be brought up to speed on trends, conduct business, and set agendas for the future. Similarly to the Annecy Festival and Market that Rüling analyzed, each of these Mexican-based festivals started as a "showcase event" (exhibitor/front of house focus) and then evolved to include "behind the screens" activities that were aimed at field transformation. As he generated his model, Rüling work identified the animation industry as the field with which Annecy's Festival and Market was concerned with configuring. Correspondingly, and based on initial research and professional experience, as I was developing my research methods I started out considering fairly broad field, namely the Mexican film industry's productivity, as the field that the festivals FICG, EEC/GIFF, and FICM were interested in impacting.

Industry connection—i.e., networking—was identified by FICG and EEC festival leadership as a key way to support Mexican filmmakers with projects and try to get them

into production pipelines. It was also a strategic way for each festival to stake an additional claim of relevancy and influence on film circuits, an objective that cannot be understated—their survival depended on it. Therefore, each festival and activity was both concerned with its own reputation, and with influencing the direction of the field of Mexican film production. By introducing events like the industry initiatives, the festivals' relevancy became intertwined with industry success in a distinct way: production numbers became a de facto benchmark of success. There was a tension from the beginning as to what this meant, because numbers are often a key benchmark for industry vitality. But as this project has discussed and will return to shortly, numbers only tell part of the story.

The festivals were successful in bringing together key industry stakeholders for meetings. However, it was clear very quickly after the first IPMs and Encuentro that this was insufficient in terms of kick-starting a substantial number of new productions. Networking remained a high priority, especially in terms of introducing national and international industry professionals to Mexican filmmakers and film projects in development; those initiatives continued to serve that purpose. Significantly, though, the IPM and Encuentro were also serving as a means through which the Mexican industry's stakeholders could gauge semi-annually how Mexican filmmakers were doing with the pitches, packaging of their projects, and meetings with professionals. The fact that Mexican filmmakers were struggling with basics revealed that there was a more fundamental issue that needed to be addressed. How could festivals help configure the direction of Mexican film production, when nationally there were so few people who even know what it meant to be a film producer? As Hugo Villa Smythe stated:

> You can't have a solid industry, a solid film industry, if you don't have a solid group of producers that sort of give you that credibility, because while great

> content creators and great content sort of have a life on its own, it doesn't lend itself to becoming industrially sound. (Villa Smythe Interview)

Observations by coordinators at EEC and at FICG from their 2004 and 2005 editions resulted in changes in approaches within the hosting festivals—EEC added other activities in compliment to the IPM, eventually creating an Industry area at GIFF, and FICG expanded on their Market and Encuentro offerings, as they were the first to develop an Industry identity at a festival in Mexico. Many of those activities would be geared towards professional formation in a more explicit fashion than was addressed through the IPM and the Encuentro. However, they were not the only organizations and industry players paying attention. IMCINE and FICM also noticed, and together they initiated the first Morelia Lab at FICM in the fall of 2005, bringing to bear Carlos Taibo from IMCINE and Andrea Stavenhagen from FICG's Encuentro into its co-direction and implementation.

This leads to a second application of field theory to the research at hand, one that is more focused on how the profession was defined and configured as it (re)emerged in Mexico. It can be helpful here to briefly consider Pierre Bourdieu's theories on fields in the sense of vocational fields, where in his model people compete to accumulate resources, training, and experience pertinent to a field in order to be recognized as legitimate members thereof. Also of significance is the idea that fields are most malleable in the arts when early in their development (ref. Bourdieu 1-73; Hilgers and Mangez). In the case of FICG, EEC/GIFF, and FICM, they were in on the ground level of defining the field of producer in Mexico from 2004/2005 on, as each festival became a site where filmmakers could learn the aspects of the business by participating in industry initiatives. When I worked with EEC/GIFF festival Director Sarah Hoch, and subsequently in the formal interview I conducted with her in 2013, she consistently treated the IPM as a

professional space first and foremost, while recognizing that not everyone professionally prepared to be there, especially in the early years. She talked with me on a number of occasions about how quickly filmmakers realized—usually the hard way—that they should have been better prepared. After that point, they could make a decision to take advantage of other opportunities to professionalize through another of EEC/GIFF's initiatives or other training, or not, but if they wanted a concrete chance to make their films, to Hoch, the decision was clear.

For her part, when interviewed, Andrea Stavenhagen detailed her perspective on the differences between the Encuentro and Morelia Lab. The Encuentro at FICG was not designed as a place for training; the Lab at FICM was. But it was not that simple, given the state of the industry. Stavenhagen said, "We presumed, sometimes in error, that once producers had a project that was ready to be at the Encuentro, that they did not need training, that they already knew how to pitch, that they knew about sales, about distribution" (Interview 2013).[117] What Stavenhagen aimed to do with her teammates during her tenures as Co-director of Industry at FICG and as Co-director of Morelia Lab, was be judicious about what stage a producer and a project was at, to try to get them into the right program for their mutual development. Both people and projects were important, and matching them to the right opportunity, critical (Interview 2013). As noted in Chapters 4 and 5, as FICG and EEC/GIFF diversified their "behind the screens" activities, they added more training and mentoring programs. FICM went a different route, with Morelia Lab being its major flagship behind the screens activity, and not as part of an "Industry" area. Together, these types of approaches contributed to a film culture that sought to instill in aspiring filmmakers the rules of the game, and the

[117] Translated from original Spanish.

recognition of what skills they should have to call themselves a "producer." A professional producer should know how to package a project and pitch it, for example. Not ready for that? Recognition of those or other areas of weakness would demonstrate an understanding of what it would take to improve in the field—an important part of the process of professionalization in itself. On reflection, the festival initiatives encouraged a prioritization of not only increasing production numbers (which did and do remain important as a marker of success), but also training where it was identified as needed in order to rebuild and reinforce industrial infrastructure.

It is clear from this study that the festivals achieved their goals of impacting national film production, and shaping how the role/field of producer in Mexican contexts was defined in the 21st century. The surge in national production that occurred from 2004 through 2011 and beyond, correlates with the festivals being sites where members of the Mexican film industry from novices to established players congregated, held panels, coordinated meetings, and caught up with each other on a regular basis. While not everyone attended each year or each festival, many major players and institutions were making this circuit by the time Morelia Lab was two years old in 2006. That said, what was initially frustrating for filmmakers who participated in the IPM and in the Encuentro—wanting to achieve results quickly, where results equate with financed and completed films—is also what can make evaluation of such initiatives challenging. It was less so with respect to Morelia Lab because Morelia Lab coordinators always took a longer view approach to their mission, explicitly foregrounding the development of producer over the completion of a particular project. However, all three initiatives did aim for results that would feed directly into business for the Mexican film industry and increased national film production. Beyond general trends that I have been able to identify while working on this research project, I am still interested in how this translated

to results on the ground level, for example, research that continues to track outcomes for films and filmmakers who participated in the IPM, Encuentro, Lab, or even other initiatives.

Longer-term studies and further interviews with participants, generating more concrete data sets over time, would be needed to assess extent the positive correlation between festival initiatives supporting filmmakers and a rise in national production numbers can be tied to causal relationships. The few film production case studies I included in this research project were inconclusive in this regard—only one in six projects drew direct and concrete results from their participation. This honestly surprised me; even though I knew that film completion rates were low overall, I expected at least a couple filmmakers to report more boost from their participation than they did. I also anticipated there to be more difference in participant experience, based on whether the filmmakers represented the more commercial vs. more art cinema project attending each initiative. Based on interviews and the histories of the selected film case studies, this did not seem to make much of a difference to these projects. Even Cinco días sin Nora (Nora's Will, 2008, Dir. Mariana Chenillo), the film that would end up the most successful of the selections on art cinema and popular circuits—and which picked up an experienced producer at the Encuentro—faced challenges in funding based on the personal nature of the script, and had difficulty finding investors willing to take a risk in backing it. All six projects' histories illustrate struggles faced just a few years ago by filmmakers producing movies in Mexico. At the time, networks were weak and most of the filmmakers, including most of the producers, were new to the game. Therefore, the opportunity to make connections and learn aspects of the business was contextualized as valuable to their professional experience. Once a filmmaker has experience, though, the type of initiative they may be interested in, the type of ongoing professional formation

they need, or the connection that will make or break a film deal, is correspondingly different. A producer who has successfully completed a number of feature film projects, and is recognized in the Mexican film industry, may not need an Incubator, or Talent Campus, or Morelia Lab for training. But they may still need training in distribution strategies, or additional networking connections outside of their circles, for example, and so could look for initiatives that provide these types of opportunities

In order to be influential in the future, festival leadership at FICG, GIFF, and FICM have to be interested in whether or not their activities continue to be perceived by industry stakeholders as must-attend events. The circuit is more competitive every year, and only a limited number of festivals can remain at the top, as industry players have to choose which venues offer the best return on travel and time investments. Additionally, now that filmmaking networks exist within the industry, more professional Mexican producers (and directors and other talent) recognized nationally and internationally, and film production has been rising annually, this will necessitate reflection on what is next for national cinema, and where festivals fit into that picture. Not only has the Mexican film industry changed dramatically in the past 10-15 years, so has the film festival landscape. As elsewhere in the world, festivals now abound in Mexico with IMCINE tracking 103 in 2014 as compared to 10 in 2000 (Anuario 2014 13, 81). Some of these have begun to challenge FICG, GIFF, and FICM on the festival and industry circuits, including the newcomer Los Cabos International Film Festival (founded as the Baja International Film Festival) which burst onto the scene in 2012. How this plays out will be provide for many opportunities for further research and evaluation. Much work has yet to be done to historicize and analyze the past, and Mexican cinema and festivals do not seem to be slowing down at present. For their parts, as of the time of writing this conclusion, Morelia Lab at FICM wrapped after its tenth edition in 2014; FICM launched

the Locarno Industry Academy in 2015, another professional formation initiative but this time focused on promotional areas including marketing, film sales, and curation. The Industry areas at FICG and GIFF continue, with modifications but in the same spirit as that profiled by this dissertation.

In his model of media capital (creative resources and goods) and media capitals (locations) in industry studies, Michael Curtin points to the complex and dynamic nature of creativity and cultural flows, both within and across borders. Although there are festivals that have made their homes in Mexico City, it is interesting to consider that the biggest festivals, especially those attracting both national and international industry members, have historically been based around the country—not in the nation's capital and the heart of its film industry. Notably, each of the festivals in this study is located just a few hours by car from Mexico City, and in a city with influence in national cultural currents. For example, Guanajuato is known for its artistic communities; Guadalajara is a significant regional center in terms of film production and also hosts an important film school; Morelia is the seat of a major film exhibitor. The decentralized nature of the work that takes place on the film festival circuit in these regional centers is another area that would benefit from longer-term studies stemming from the current project. The festivals in Guadalajara, Guanajuato, and Morelia have played roles in shaping the conversation about the state of the industry, through the films they have exhibited, the panels they have convened, the events they have planned, and the initiatives they have created.

One major way the festivals have influenced flows of capital between the media capital and other parts of Mexico is that they have explicitly attracted creative people from all over Mexico to their locales, where they intermingled either through planned meetings or more informal shoulder-rubbing at events. As one illustrative example,

Morelia Lab in 2007 organized its selection by explicitly incorporating one producer selected by an advisor from each of the following organizations:

- Centro de Capacitación Cinematográfica (CCC),[118]
- Centro Universitario de Estudios Cinematográficos (University Center for Cinematographic Studies, or CUEC),
- Dirección de Producción Audiovisual de la Universidad de Guadalajara (the Audiovidual Production Division of the University of Guadalajara),
- Academia Jalisciense de Cinematografía (Jalisco's Academy of Cinematography),
- Asociación de Cineastas de Michoacán (Association of Michoacan Filmmakers, or IMAGINA),
- Cineastas de Coahuila (Filmmakers from Coahila, or CINCO),
- Gremio de Cineastas de Nuevo León (Filmmakers Guild of Nuevo León). (Morelia Lab, "Morelia Lab 2007")

While the first two schools are based in Mexico City, students attending the CCC and the CUEC are not necessarily from there; even if they are, inviting them to Morelia allows them to meet with others from elsewhere in the republic, for example with filmmakers based in the states of Coahila or Nuevo León, which are actually closer geographically to the US than they are to Mexico City or Morelia. All of the above and more met in Morelia with each other, with invited mentors, and with others attending the FICM. These encounters have the potential to influence national film production and media flows in a way that, in Curtin's terms would add sociocultural variation to Mexico's media landscape (in creativity, labor, and product) even while Mexico City maintains its status as the most significant media capital of the nation (ref. Curtin 115). Both

[118] Literally translated along the lines of the Center for Film Training, the school's name "Centro de Capacitación Cinematográfica" is rarely translated into English and is referred to as "el CCC" or "the CCC."

EEC/GIFF and FICG also have diversity built in to some of their Industry activities. For example, EEC/GIFF's Rally Universitario (University Rally) by its design brings together students in teams from all over the country to participate in filmmaking contests, and they have other activities similarly designed. For its part, FICG has a number of initiatives under their "Formación / Formation" designation that reach out to up-and-coming filmmakers from all over Mexico and Latin America.

Something important to point out about the regional nature of these major festivals, is that while in one sense attending them may be disruptive to daily work flow from a home base, in another sense, taking the time to attend events away from the home office can provide a retreat-like atmosphere focused on the tasks at hand. To think of Rüling's model, the execution of the event provides for a particular space and time set aside explicitly for industry field configuration. With so much of Mexico's industry based in and working out of Mexico City, and the fact that Mexico City and its environs are expansive and incredibly complex to navigate, the festival cities and venues have provided infrastructure, while temporarily providing centralized locations for business opportunities for industry attendees. Activities including those profiled also exert influence outside of Mexico, not just within. While not a major focus of the dissertation, each festival actively promotes Mexican cinema's visibility in international contexts both by inviting in guests to their locales, and by partnering with organizations such as Cannes to facilitate screenings of Mexican films abroad. If we think in terms of international media capital and capitals, in more global contexts, the festivals have also been working to legitimize Mexican cinema as viable and vital on world stages, as worthy of continued attention and future investment.

To explicitly return to Curtin's work, it has to date primarily focused on media industries, media capital, and cultural labor at the level of theatrical exhibition, radio and

television broadcast, and the like. This project as a whole was influenced by Curtin's approach, which keeps an eye on the ways in which national and regional centers of media capital mutually influence each other. Because this study primarily focused on historicizing film festivals in the Mexican national context, and then on their support for production in very particular cases, more research is certainly needed to achieve the complexity that would do justice to analysis along Curtin's lines. However, by at least the measures noted in the previous paragraphs, the festivals in question have functioned as regional centers of influence on debates about the state of the industry, and set the direction for initiatives aimed at course correction of identified weaknesses in that industry. Investigating deeper connections both in national media contexts, and between Mexican and other world industries would be illuminating to recent Mexican film history and analysis. Furthermore, Curtin's model would be enhanced by incorporating analyses of film festivals as productive sites for both the circulation of media capital as well as hubs that attract to them the next generations of cultural labor. Research that expands analysis of their influence on these latter areas provides a great deal of opportunity for continued study.

This conclusion has largely focused on reviewing festivals' achievements in revitalizing Mexican film industry production, through focusing attention and resources towards cultivating a class or field of professional producers. There is no doubt that the industry's production infrastructure in the 2010s is much better off than it was in the late 1990s and early 2000s. In fact, if we go by numbers, Anna Marie de la Fuente for Variety reported that according to IMCINE's annual statistical yearbook, more films were produced in 2015 than any previous year in Mexican film history. IMCINE counted 140 features, a tally which exceeded even the height of Mexico's Golden Age. Additionally, she wrote:

> The unprecedented collaboration of the National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI) in this edition revealed that Mexican film industry's contribution to the national economy was more robust than expected. "It is seven times more dynamic than the overall Mexican economy," it reported, citing that the average increase of 6.7% in the local film industry's GDP between 2008 and 2013 far exceeded the total national GDP of 1.4%. ("Mexican Film Institute")

However, while these production numbers are impressive, it remains of significance that the festivals FICG, GIFF, and FICM, each one launched in a different decade, were founded with an eye on addressing the fact that Mexican film exhibition was dominated by Hollywood fare. Even though film production was up, many of the films were not reaching audiences—for example, only about half of the features produced in 2011 made it to a theatrical release (Gutiérrez). With piracy being a huge problem, distributors barely released any films on DVD; of the 62 films from 2011 that were released theatrically, only 13 were authorized for subsequent DVD release. Network television reportedly was not any better, as stations preferred airing catalog films to new releases (Gutiérrez). Furthermore, even though production numbers for 2015 were historic, market share remained low, as de la Fuente reported, "Of the 286 million tix sold [in 2015], only 17.5 million accounted for homegrown fare, a 6.5% share" ("Mexican Film Institute").

These latter statistics points to an interesting fact. Even as FICG and GIFF ramped up industry areas, and FICM hosted Morelia Lab—all of them contributing to forums and initiatives that bolstered filmmaking networks and promoted the professionalization of producers as key to reinvigorating Mexican cinema—the festivals were and will likely continue to be needed to fulfill an important role as exhibitors of national cinema. This serves the role of both providing Mexican audiences access to Mexican films, but also Mexican filmmakers with access to audiences. How to translate the interest and buzz from the festival to theatrical release remains a problem in need of solution. It further remains a challenge abroad as world audiences—especially in Europe

and the United States—are also most familiar with Mexican films that have circulated on the festival circuit. This is not unique to Mexican films in local or global contexts, as international films that circulate on the art circuit in Cinematheques or in festivals face the same struggles trying to break out into theatrical or other distribution windows. This dynamic informs the history of why festivals tend to partner with other cultural organizations to advocate for the exhibition of "quality" cinema.

At the same time, even as the festivals fulfill this role as curator and cultural advocate through the exhibition of films, their eye on industry infrastructure and advocacy for making it work for filmmakers is, in my estimation, their most important contribution to national cinema. With a long view of Mexican history in mind, we should acknowledge just how vulnerable the Mexican film industry was in the recent past, and while the festivals FICG, GIFF, and FICM have served as an important nexus of bringing attention to the diversity of possibilities in filmmaking, concerted efforts are still needed if the industry is to continue to show signs of increased vitality. This research project has focused a great deal of attention on IMCINE and in particular on FOPROCINE, FIDECINE, and EFICINE. However, IMCINE does administer other funds besides these, and funding at the national level, as well as funding from the public sector, only represent part of the story. It is an important part, however. As de la Fuente reports, "70% of the pics made in Mexico are supported by the state" ("Mexican Film Institute"). Festivals with industry areas like FICG, GIFF, and FICM do serve to connect filmmakers to such funds, but they also provide environments that surround filmmakers with a variety of resources and connections that can be tapped into besides national public funds. The film case studies from this project illustrate this to a degree, as some were backed by local governments and private investors.

In addition to the festivals and the initiatives studied here, the diversification of funding sources is one of the most significant changes in recent years in Mexican cinema history. Post Banco Cinematográfico, both public and private sectors have been adjusting to the changing landscape of funds and the waves of policy emanating from the subsequent presidential administrations. Under the current administration of Enrique Peña Nieto, whose term began in late 2012, cuts have been made to the cinematographic sectors, including to production funds. Peña Nieto is a member of the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (Institutional Revolutionary Party, or PRI), the party that had been in power at the presidential for decades, and only out of that position for the two terms of Vicente Fox (2000-2006) and Felipe Calderón (2006-2012), who both were from the Partido Acción Nacional (National Action Party, or PAN). Within the cultural sectors, Peña Nieto's policies are perceived by many to be returning to the old closed networks, and almost immediately after his appointment, his administration began budget cuts to the cinematographic sectors. How filmmakers weather this down the line will likely reveal new strengths and weaknesses in industrial infrastructure, which will require stakeholders to adjust accordingly. Festivals are likely to continue to play important roles in these conversations and in the vitality of the cinematographic landscape in Mexico. The global film world is also one of constant change. For their part, these festivals and new ones on the scene have demonstrated that there are communities interested in the future of Mexican cinema, both in terms of creative producers and audience members, and that provides hope that that they can find solutions to the current set of challenges as well as rise to meet new ones.

Appendices

APPENDIX A: ACRONYMS

	Spanish	**English**
AMPAS		Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences
BAFICI	Buenos Aires Festival Internacional de Cine Independiente	Buenos Aires International Festival of Independent Film
CACI	Conferencia de Autoridades Cinematográficas de Iberoamérica	Conference of Ibero-American Cinematographic Authorities
CAACI	Conferencia de Autoridades Audiovisuales y Cinematográficas de Iberoamérica	Conference of Ibero-American Audiovisual and Film Authorities
CCC	Centro de Capacitación Cinematográfica	Center for Film Training[119]
CIEC	Centro de Investigación y Enseñanza Cinematográficas	Center for Cinematographic Training and Research
CINCO	Cineastas de Coahuila	Filmmakers from Coahuila
CLAIFF		Cine Las Americas International Film Festival
CONACINE	Corporación Nacional Cinematográfica	National Film Corporation
CONACITE	Corporación Nacional Cinematográfica de Trabajadores y Estado	National Film Corporation of Workers and State
CONACULTA	Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes	The National Council for Culture and the Arts
CUEC	Centro Universitario de Estudios Cinematográficos	University Center for Cinematographic Studies
DISCA	Dirección de Investigación Científica y Superación Académica	Direction of Scientific Inquiry and Academic Improvement
DocsDF	Festival Internacional de Cine Documental de la Ciudad de México	Mexico City International Documentary Film Festival

[119] Although I provide a translation, the school's name "Centro de Capacitación Cinematográfica" is in practice rarely translated into English. Instead it is referred to as "el CCC" or "the CCC."

	Spanish	**English**
EEC	Festival Internacional de Cine "Expresión en Corto"	"Expresión en Corto" International Film Festival[120]
EFICINE	Estímulo Fiscal a la Producción Cinematográfica Nacional	Financial Stimulus for National Cinematic Production
EPROCINE	Stimulus for Promotion of Mexican Film	Stimulus for Promotion of Mexican Film
FFCC	Fondo de Fomento a la Calidad Cinematográfica	Development Fund for Quality Cinema
FICCO	Festival Internacional de Cine Contemporáneo	Mexico City International Contemporary Film Festival
FICG	Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara	Guadalajara International Film Festival[121]
FICM	Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia	Morelia International Film Festival
FICMonterrey	Festival Internacional de Cine de Monterrey	Monterrey International Film Festival
FIDECINE	Fondo de Inversión y Estímulos al Cine	Fund for Film Investment and Stimulation
FOPROCINE	Fondo para la Producción Cinematográfica de Calidad	Fund for the Production of Quality Films
GFI		Global Film Initiative
GIFF	Festival Internacional de Cine Guanajuato	Guanajuato International Film Festival[122]
HBF		Hubert Bals Fund
IFFR		International Film Festival Rotterdam
IMAGINA	Asociación de Cineastas de Michoacán	Association of Michoacan Filmmakers
IMCINE	Instituto Mexicano de la Cinematografía	Mexican Cinematographic Institute

[120] The name Expresión en Corto (EEC) is a play on words of sorts, as "Corto" means "short" as in the length of any object, and also it means "short film." The festival's name can be translated awkwardly as "Short Expressions," "Expressions in Short Form" or "Expressions in Short Film," but Expresión en Corto as an organization is always referred to as such, in Spanish. As of 2011, the festival changed names to Guanajuato International Film Festival (GIFF), with its non-profit branch still named Expresión en Corto.
[121] The Guadalajara International Film Festival (FICG) was founded in 1986 as the "Muestra de Cine Mexicano en Guadalajara" (Mexican Film Showcase in Guadalajara). In 2005, for the 20th edition, the name of the festival officially converted to FICG.
[122] See note 2, above.

	Spanish	**English**
INCAA	Instituto Nacional de Cine y Artes Audiovisuales	National Institute of Film and Audiovisual Arts (Argentina)
IPM		International Pitching Market
ITAM	Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México	Autonomous Technological Institute of Mexico
LALIFF		Los Angeles Latino International Film Festival
MPA		Motion Pictures Association Audiovisual Entertainment for Global Audiences
MPAA		Motion Pictures Association of America
MCYTV	Mujeres en el Cine y la Televisión	Women and Film and Television International (also see WIFTI)
OCIC	Organización Católica Internacional del Cine y el Audiovisual	International Catholic Organisation for Cinema
PAN	Partido Acción Nacional	National Action Party
PRD	Partido de la Revolución Democrática	Party of the Democratic Revolution
PRI	Partido Revolucionario Institucional	Institutional Revolutionary Party
SOGEM	Sociedad General de Escritores de México	Mexican Writers Guild
STPC	Sindicato de Trabajadores de la Producción Cinematográfica	Workers Union for Mexican Film Production
TyPA	Fundación TyPA; Teoría y Práctica de las Artes	Foundation TyPA; Theory and Practice in the Arts
UDG	Universidad de Guadalajara	University of Guadalajara
UNAM	Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México	National Autonomous University of Mexico
UNESCO		United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization
UNIVA	Universidad del Valle de Atemajac	Atemajac Valley University
VFS		Vancouver Film School
WIFTI		Women and Film and Television International (also see MCYTV)

APPENDIX B: PROJECTS SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE 1ST INTERNATIONAL PITCHING MARKET, EXPRESIÓN EN CORTO INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL, GUANAJUATO, MEXICO, 2004

1IPM – Mexican Narrative Projects

Working Title	Presenting Production Company	Completed Title, Year, Country, Director[123]
Ánima solitaria / Contra el destino	MediaPro	
Bajo el mismo techo	Cuévano Films / La Banda Films	Aquí entre nos (Between Us), 2011, Mexico/USA, Patricia Martínez de Velasco
Cuatro capas de gris	Argos / Cuatro y Medio	
Desierto adentro	Argos	Desierto adentro (The Desert Within), 2009, Mexico, Rodrigo Plá
El ángel, la muerte y el cazador	Séptimo Arte	Polvo de ángel (Angel Dust), 2010, Mexico/Colombia, Óscar Blancarte
El fuego despierta	Argos	
El lugar que llaman vida	Empresa MX Casa Productora	
En sueños	Fantasmas Films	
Entre caníbales	Mitote Productions México	Entre caníbales (Among Cannibals), 2007, Mexico, Rodrigo González
La lotería	Leo Media Productions	
La Nao de China	Bravo Films	La última mirada (The Last Gaze), 2006, Mexico, Patricia Arriaga-Jordán
La otra mejilla	Mandarina Films	
La rosa de California	Viriato Films, Rybnikov & Asociados / Katarsis Comunicación / MediaProducciones	
Madrid-México	Instituto Cinematográfico Lumiere	Al acecho del leopard, 2011, Mexico, Enrique Renteria
Mezcal	Malayerba Producciones	Mezcal, 2006, Mexico, Ignacio Ortiz

[123] In parallel to chapter content, completion data for this appendix is based on information available by end of year 2013.

Párpados azules	Hartos indios	Párpados azules (Blue Eyelids), 2007, Mexico, Ernesto Contreras
Radicales libres	Traziende Producciones	Efectos secundarios (Side Effects), 2006, Mexico, Issa López
Sexo sin rodeos	Jade Films	Deseo (Desire), 2010, Mexico, Antonio Zavala Kugler
Sin límite de tiempo	Malayerba Producciones	
Un hombre solo	Tres Piedras Producciones / TVI	

APPENDIX C: PROJECTS SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE 2ND INTERNATIONAL PITCHING MARKET, EXPRESIÓN EN CORTO INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL, GUANAJUATO, MEXICO, 2005

2IPM – Mexican Narrative Projects

Working Title	**Representative Person or Production Company**	**Completed Title, Year, Country, Director[124]**
A propósito de Alexa	René Bueno	Recién cazado, 2009, Mexico, Rene Bueno
Alicia en la noche	Walter Navas	
Así	XUL Producciones	Así (Just Like That), 2005, Mexico, Jesús Mario Lozano
Borrar de la memoria	Arte 2001	Borrar de la memoria (Erase from Memory), 2011, Mexico, Alfredo Gurrola
Como la palma de mi mano	Festival de Canes	
Conozca la cabeza de Juan Pérez	Centro de Capacitación Cinematográfica / Ultra Films	Conozca la cabeza de Juan Pérez (Meet the Head of Juan Pérez), 2008, Mexico, Emilio Portes
Crepúsculo rojo	Producciones Rayuela	Crepúsculo rojo (Red Twilight), 2009, Mexico, Carlos González
Deseos del corazón	Watson Films	
El señor del sombrero grande	El Sombrerote	
El último guerrero	Producciones Tobari	
Infernal lover	Lux Aeterna Producciones	
Julia	Manifiesto Films / Indie Eye Productions	
Opción B	Cine Feroz	
Oro, el hijo del Calavera	El Hijo del Calavera	
Palabra de macho	Haluro Digital	
Perfume de gardenias	El Séptimo Sello	
Propiedad ajena	Chile Films / Fílmica Producciones	Propiedad ajena (The Land of Another), 2007, Mexico, Luis Vélez
Semana mayor	Voladero Films	

[124] In parallel to chapter content, completion data for this appendix is based on information available by end of year 2013.

Sonámbulo	Kornea Films	
Story of a great team	Imagination Films	Z-Baw, 2011, Mexico, Ricardo Gomez

APPENDIX D: PROJECTS SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE 3RD INTERNATIONAL PITCHING MARKET, EXPRESIÓN EN CORTO INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL, GUANAJUATO, MEXICO, 2006

3IPM – Mexican Narrative Projects

Working Title	**Representative Person or Production Company**	**Completed Title, Year, Country, Director[125]**
Adiós mundo cruel	Avanti Pictures	Adiós mundo cruel (Goodbye Cruel World), 2010, Mexico, Jack Zagha
Allende el mar	SIC Films	
Criósfera	Elemento Producciones	
De mujeres y hombres	Fantasmas Films	
El legado	Gerardo Lara	
Esta no es una película	Lynn Fanchtein	This Is Not a Movie, 2009, Mexico, Olallo Rubio
Girón de niebla	Hilo Negro Films	
Hasta el viento tiene miedo	Gonzalo Elvira Alvarez	Hasta el viento tiene miedo (The Wind of Fear), 2007, Mexico, Gustavo Moheno
Historia sobre un corazón roto	Julio Cesar Dovalina	
La Ticla	Laguna Pictures	Amar a morir (Love 'Till Death), 2009, Mexico/Colombia, Fernando Lebrija
Malverde	Indi Films	
Memorias de un Don Nadie	Traziende Films	
Mordidas	Tosco Films	Bala mordida (Bitten Bullet), 2009, Mexico, Diego Muñoz
Rómpeme la cara	Cuadrante Films	
Sabel, Redención	Benito Fernández	Sabel, Redención (Sabel Redemption), 2009, Mexico, Benito Fernández
Visitantes	Acán Coen	
Voodoo Bayou	Ciberfilms	

[125] In parallel to chapter content, completion data for this appendix is based on information available by end of year 2013.

APPENDIX E: PROJECTS SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE 4TH INTERNATIONAL PITCHING MARKET, EXPRESIÓN EN CORTO INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL, GUANAJUATO, MEXICO, 2007

4IPM – Mexican Narrative Projects

Working Title	**Representative Person or Production Company**	**Completed Title, Year, Country, Director**[126]
Carroñeros (The Scavengers)	Habanero Films / De Cuernos al Abismo Films	
Cual hoja al viento (As a Leaf in the Wind)	Vlady Realizadores	
Depositarios (Depositaries)	De Cuernos al Abismo Films	Depositarios (Depositaries), 2010, Mexico, Rodrigo Ordoñez
Eden	Elise Du Rant	
El rapto (The Kidnapping)	Kinesis Films	
Estocada	Altavista Films / Indie Eye Productions	
Gloria en las alturas (Glory in the Heights)	Studio Films	
La brújula la lleva el muerto (The Compass Is Carried by the Dead Man)	Artemecánica Producciones	La brújula la lleva el muerto (The Compass Is Carried by the Dead Man), 2011, Mexico, Arturo Pons
Livin' on the Edge	Quadrum Producciones	

4IPM – Additional Project

Working Title	**Country**[127]	**Presenting Production Company**
The Shore Thing (La cosa de la costa)	USA	Adelante Films

[126] In parallel to chapter content, completion data for this appendix is based on information available by end of year 2013.

[127] Completion data not compiled for projects from countries other than Mexico.

APPENDIX F: PROJECTS SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE 5TH INTERNATIONAL PITCHING MARKET, EXPRESIÓN EN CORTO INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL, GUANAJUATO, MEXICO, 2008

5IPM – Crossover Projects[128]

Working Title	Country	Presenting Production Company
Chronicles of Don Sebastian	USA	Judi Jordan Productions
Los muchachos de la tierra y la leyenda de la copa	Mexico	Fantico
Feet Afire	USA	Judi Jordan Productions

5IPM – MexiCannes Projects

Working Title	Country	Presenting Director / Production Company
El lugar del hijo	Uruguay	Manuel Nieto Zas / Rocken Films
For Love with Best Intentions	Romania	Adrian Sitaru / Movie Partners in Motion Film
Las oscuras primaveras (The Obscure Spring)	Mexico	Ernesto Contreras / Agencia SHA
Stellvertreterkrieg (Silver Volts)	Germany	Nikias Chryssos
The Other Side of Sleep	Ireland	Rebecca Daly

[128] Completion data not compiled for projects from countries other than Mexico. Additionally, since there were only two Mexican-based projects at the IPM this year, and neither were completed within the study's timeframe, there is no completion data included in this appendix.

APPENDIX G: PROJECTS SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE 6TH INTERNATIONAL PITCHING MARKET, EXPRESIÓN EN CORTO INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL, GUANAJUATO, MEXICO, 2009

6IPM – Mexican Narrative Projects

Working Title	Selection Designation	Representative (Person and/or Production Company)	Completed Title, Year, Country, Director[129]
Arete	Mexico/UK Crossover	Gira 35	
Camino al mar (Walk into the Sea)	MexiCannes	Michel Franco / Pop Films / Alameda Films	Después de Lucía (After Lucia), 2012, Mexico/France, Michel Franco
Cannamérica	Mexico	United Angels Productions	
El ánima	Mexico	Cyclus	
Habanero	Mexico	Campos Films	
Inmaculados (Trespassers)	Mexico	Akira Films	
Inzomnia	Mexico	Mauricio Katz / Luis Téllez	
Obediencia perfecta (Perfect Obedience)	Mexico	Astillero Films	
Prodigios (Prodigies)	Mexico	Maraca Films	
Restaurante (Restaurant)	Mexico	Traziende Films	
Stroke	MexiCannes	Daniela Schneider / Una Comunión	Cesado (Stroke), 2011, Mexico, Daniela Schneider
Una realidad aparte (Worlds Apart)	Mexico/UK Crossover	Camelia Films	
Ventanas al mar (Window to the Sea)	Mexico	Xul Productions	Ventanas al mar (Window to the Sea), 2012, Mexico, Jesús Mario Lozano
Viaje a Tulum (Journey to Tulum)	Mexico	Fellini Films / Aracne Studio	

[129] In parallel to chapter content, completion data for this appendix is based on information available by end of year 2013.

6IPM – Additional Projects

Working Title	Selection Designation	Country[130]	Representative (Person and/or Production Company)
30 Days with Me	MexiCannes	Iran/Kurdistan /Iraq	Babak Amini / Mij Film Co.
Feed Me with Your Words	MexiCannes	Slovenia/Italy	Martin Turk / Bela Film
I Was Bono's Doppelganger	Mexico/UK Crossover	UK	Piers Tempest / Mark Huffam / Ian Flooks
Polvo (Dust)	MexiCannes	Guatemala/ Mexico[131]	Julio Hernández Cordón / Melindrosa Films / Tic Tac Producciones / JA Productions
Teva (Nature)	MexiCannes	Israel	Yula Gidron
The Infidel	Mexico/UK Crossover	UK	Arvind Ethan David
The Next Gael (El próximo Gael)	Mexico/UK Crossover	UK	Scala Productions
The Revenant	MexiCannes	Germany	Andreas Bolm / Weltfilm
Transit of Venus	MexiCannes	Hungary	Anna Faur
Up on the Roof	MexiCannes	Poland/ Hungary	Rafael Kapelinski / Braidmade Films / Grand Pictures / Aurora Film Production
Wild Life	Mexico/UK Crossover	UK	Hugo Films

[130] Completion data not compiled for projects from countries other than Mexico.

[131] Although listed as a Guatemala/Mexico coproduction in some festival materials, I decided not to include Polvo in the "Mexican" list in this appendix. The film is about the aftermath of the violence that took place in Guatemala during the 1980s, and also it ended up being completed as a Guatemala/Spain/ Chile/Germany coproduction.

APPENDIX H: PROJECTS SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE 7TH INTERNATIONAL PITCHING MARKET, EXPRESIÓN EN CORTO INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL, GUANAJUATO, MEXICO, 2010

7IPM – Mexican Narrative Projects

Working Title	Selection Designation	Representative (Person and/or Production Company)	Completed Title, Year, Country, Director[132]
Amanda	Mexico	Productora 35mm	
Brisa 160	Mexico	Kornea Films	
Clipperton	Mexico	Triana Films	
El Americano	Mexico	Animex Estudios	
Gonzo	Mexico	Entropía	
Hecho en México (Made in Mexico)	Mexico	Productora 35mm	
La cebra (The Zebra)	Mexico	Cinemágico Producciones	La cebra (The Zebra), 2011, Mexico, Fernando Javier León Rodríguez
Los últimos cristeros (The Last Christeros)	MexiCannes	Matías Meyer / Axolote Cine / IDTV Films	Los últimos cristeros (The Last Christeros), 2012, Mexico/Netherlands, Matías Meyer
Noche cero	Mexico	Atko Films	
Nos vemos, papá (See You, Dad)	Mexico	Machete Producciones	Nos vemos, papá (See You, Dad), 2011, Lucía Carreras, Mexico
Obispo verde	Mexico	United Angels	
Paraísos artificiales (Artificial Paradises)	MexiCannes	Yulene Olaizola / Interior 13	Paraísos artificiales (Artificial Paradises), 2011, Mexico, Yulene Olaizola
Pasajeros (Passengers)	Mexico	Akira Producciones	
Tiempos felices (Happy Times)	Mexico	Celuloide Films / Moon Light Pictures	
Un accidente (An Accident)	Mexico	Artemecánica	

[132] In parallel to chapter content, completion data for this appendix is based on information available by end of year 2013.

7IPM – Additional Projects

Working Title	Selection Designation	Country[133]	Representative (Person and/or Production Company)
After the Wedding	MexiCannes	USA/ Romania	Ioana Uricaru
Atlántida	Argentina/ Crossover	Argentina	Oruga Films
Bonsái	MexiCannes	Chile	Cristián Jiménez / Jirafa
De jueves a domingo (Thursday to Sunday)	MexiCannes	Chile	Dominga Sotomayor / Cinestación / Forastero
Gente de bien	MexiCannes	Colombia/ France	Franco Lolli / Laberinto Cine / Lazennec et associés
Tan Huan (The Paralytics)	MexiCannes	China	Zhang Yue
The Weight of Elephants	MexiCannes	Denmark/ New Zealand	Daniel Borgman / Zentropa
Tratanto Padrotes (Dealing with Pimps)	Mexico (Doc)[134]	Mexico	Cotorra Films
Todos nosotros (All of Us)	MexiCannes	Costa Rica	Paz Fábrega / Temporal Films

[133] Completion data not compiled for projects from countries other than Mexico.
[134] Completion data not compiled for Mexican documentary films.

APPENDIX I: PROJECTS SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE 8TH INTERNATIONAL PITCHING MARKET, EXPRESIÓN EN CORTO INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL, GUANAJUATO, MEXICO, 2011

8IPM – Mexican Narrative Projects

Working Title[135]	**Selection Designation**	**Presenting Production Company**
Belzebuth	Mexico	Pizcacha Films
Bitter Grapes	Mexico	Spectrum Films
Criósfera (Cryosphere)	Mexico	Elemento Producciones
Dead by Sundown	Mexico	Brilliant Screen Studios / Maverick Arts
El callejón de los sueños (The Alley of Dreams)	Mexico	Imagination Films
El club de las viudas (Widows Club)	Mexico	Cerbero Films
El hotel (The Hotel)	Mexico	Mexcine
El mejor de los mundos imposibles (The Best of Impossible Worlds)	Mexico	Fara Fara Films
Esperando a los bárbaros (Waiting for the Barbarians)	Mexico	Ciudad Cinema / Mil Nubes
Fausto el mago extremo (Fausto the Extreme Wizard)	Mexico	Haini Animación / Grupo Escomic
Hilos de sangre (Blood Threads)	Mexico	Desvelados Films
Juan y Vanesa (Juan and Vanesa)	Mexico	Artepepan Films / Les Films d'Ici / Penrose Film
Justicia Divina (Divine Justice)	Mexico/Korea Crossover	Krystian Mohzo / Jesús Bretón
La habitación (The Room)	Mexico	Machete Producciones
Las aventuras de Manu (The Adventures of Manu)	Mexico/Korea Crossover	AVK Medios
Las voces (The Voices)	Mexico	Carlos Armella / Dreammaker Productions / Maquina Films
Los viajes de Kalazul (The Voyages of Kalazul)	Mexico/Korea Crossover	Insomnia Producciones

[135] Since none of these projects were completed within the study's timeframe, there is no completion data included in this appendix.

Moni	Mexico	Southern Lights Entertainment
Monkey Island	Mexico	Ciberfilms / Occupant Films
Rumbos paralelos (Parallel Courses)	Mexico	Toma Siete
Sole	MexiCannes	Pedro Gómez Millán / Paladar Films

8IPM – Additional Projects

Working Title	**Selection Designation**	**Country[136]**	**Representative (Person and/or Production Company)**
A Korean Market	Mexico/Korea Crossover	USA	Fuzzy California
Arunkarn	MexiCannes	Thailand	Sivaroj Kongsakul / Pop Pictures
B for Boy	MexiCannes	Nigeria	Chika Anadu / No Blondes Productions
Bastard	MexiCannes	Germany	David Nawrath
Entomology	MexiCannes	Russia	Julia Kozyreva
Goyangiga Janda (The Cat Is Sleeping)	Mexico/Korea Crossover	South Korea	Panda Media
¿Imposible? Vida y expediciones de Vital Alsar (Impossible? Vital Alsar's Life and Expeditions)	Mexico (Doc)[137]	Mexico	Héctor E. López / Francisco Enrique Bernal Venegas
Las sufragistas (The Suffragists)	Mexico (Doc)	Mexico	AC Arte y Cultura en Movimiento
Tam Rasisalia	MexiCannes	Thailand	Pramote Sangsorn / House on Fire

[136] Completion data not compiled for projects from countries other than Mexico.
[137] Completion data not compiled for Mexican documentary films.

APPENDIX J: PROJECTS SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE 1ST ENCUENTRO IBEROAMERICANO DE COPRODUCCIÓN CINEMATOGRÁFICA, FESTIVAL INTERNACIONAL DE CINE EN GUADALAJARA, MEXICO, 2005

I Encuentro – Mexican Narrative Projects (Produced or Co-Produced)

Working Title	**Country**[138]	**Director**	**Production Company**	**Completed Title, Year, Country, Director**[139]
Cinco días sin Nora	Mexico	Mariana Chenillo	La Maroma	Cinco días sin Nora (Nora's Will), 2008, Mexico, Mariana Chenillo
Corazón del tiempo	Mexico	Alberto Cortés	Bataclán Cinematografía	Corazón del tiempo (Heart of Time), 2009, Mexico/Spain, Alberto Cortés
El lugar que llaman vida	Mexico	Claudio Isaac	MX Casa Productora	
En sueños	Mexico	Carlos Salces	Fantasmas Films	
La calavera de cristal	Mexico	Nicolas Echevarria	Cuadro Negro	
La Yuma	Nicaragua	Florence Jaugey	Camila Films	La Yuma (Yuma), 2009, France/ Mexico/Spain/ Nicaragua, Florence Jaugey
Nostalgia del tiburón	Mexico	Alberto Gómez	Catán Films	
Párpados azules	Mexico	Ernesto Contreras	Agencia Sha	Párpados azules (Blue Eyelids), 2007, Mexico, Ernesto Contreras

[138] Since this section of Appendix J includes projects completed with a Mexican producer or co-producer, the "Country" column clarifies which country was associated with the project at the time of acceptance to the Encuentro.

[139] In parallel to chapter content, completion data for this appendix is based on information available by end of year 2013.

Perfume de gardenias	Mexico	Enrique Arroyo Schroeder	El Séptimo Sello	
Quemar las naves	Mexico	Francisco Franco	Quemar Las Naves Producciones	Quemar las naves (Burn the Bridges), 2007, Mexico, Francisco Franco Alba
Una historia de amor y otros accidentes	Mexico	Silvana Zuanetti	Angela Producciones	

I Encuentro – Additional Projects

Working Title	**Country**[140]	**Director**	**Producer and/or Production Company**
14 abriles locos	El Salvador	Noe Valladares	Amanda Producciones
2600 metros	Colombia / Argentina	Roberto Flores Prieto	Kimera Producciones / Mateina Films
31 minutos, la película	Chile	Álvaro Díaz & Pedro Peirano	Producciones Aplaplac
De ciervos y mariposas	Argentina	Maria Berns	Cine Ojo
Día naranja	Venezuela	Alejandra Szeplaki	Cooperativa Estrella Films
El rey de los huevones	Chile / Spain	Boris Querencia	Chilechitá / Aldea Films
Isla de paz	Ecuador	Ecuador	Mauricio Samaniego / Cabezahueca Producciones
No le digas	Bolivia	Mela Márquez Saleg	Amarcord Producciones
Pasajeros	Peru	Andrés Cotler	Pasajeros Producciones

[140] Completion data not compiled for projects from countries other than Mexico, with the exception of those completed with a Mexican producer or co-producer by the end of 2013, in which case they appear in the first section of Appendix J.

APPENDIX K: PROJECTS SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE 2ND ENCUENTRO IBEROAMERICANO DE COPRODUCCIÓN CINEMATOGRÁFICA, FESTIVAL INTERNACIONAL DE CINE EN GUADALAJARA, MEXICO, 2006

II Encuentro – Mexican Narrative Projects (Produced or Co-Produced)

Working Title	Country[141]	Director	Production Company	Completed Title, Year, Country, Director[142]
18 cigarrillos y medio	Paraguay	Marcelo Adrián Tolces	Productora Audiovisual Cine – Mata Producciones	18 cigarrillos y medio (18 and a Half Cigarettes), 2010, Mexico/ Paraguay, Marcelo Tolces
Ángel caído	Mexico	Arturo Anaya Treviño	La última y nos vamos	Ángel caído (Fallen Angel), 2010, Mexico, Arturo Anaya
Cochochi	Mexico	Laura Amelia Guzmán	Blueberry Films	Cochochi, 2007, Mexico/UK/Canada, Israel Cárdenas & Laura Amelia Guzmán
Depositarios (El sol en tu espalda)	Mexico	Rodrigo Ordóñez	De Cuernos al Abismo Films / Calabazitaz Tiernaz	Depositarios (Depositaries), 2010, Mexico, Rodrigo Ordoñez
Espérame en otro mundo	Mexico	Juan Pablo Villaseñor	A 7 Producciones	Espérame en otro mundo (Wait for Me in Another World), 2007, Mexico, Juan Pablo Villaseñor
Hombre de una pieza	Mexico	Celso García	Cierto Pelo Films	
Instrumental	Mexico	Jesús Mario Lozano	Xulp (Xul Producciones)	

[141] Since this section of Appendix K includes projects completed with a Mexican producer or co-producer, the "Country" column clarifies which country was associated with the project at the time of acceptance to the Encuentro.

[142] In parallel to chapter content, completion data for this appendix is based on information available by end of year 2013.

Sonámbulo	Mexico	Diego Arredondo	Kornea Films	
Todos los días son tuyos	Mexico	José Luis Gutiérrez Arias	Goliat Films	Todos los días son tuyos (Every Day Is Yours), 2007, Mexico, José Luis Gutiérrez
Una historia mexicana	Mexico	Artur Aristakisian	Mantarraya Producciones	

II Encuentro – Additional Projects

Working Title	**Country**[143]	**Director**	**Production Company**
Barroco andino	Bolivia/ Argentina	Fernando Vargas Villazón	Imagen Propia
García	Colombia	Director TBD / Script: Diego Ezequiel Vivanco	Pentagrama Films
Incómodos	Argentina	Celso García	Cierto Pelo Films
Jardines del paraíso	Peru	Esteban Menis	Todo Cine
La maldición de Ximux	Colombia/ Argentina	Héctor Adrián	Chullachaki Producciones
Omertá	Cuba	Darío Colmenares	ART TV Producciones
Payasas muertas	Argentina	Pavel Giroud	ICAIC
Rumbo sur	Chile	Ana Rovoira	Lagarto Cine
Supervivencia	Argentina	Marcelo Ferrari	Imagen Films
Un funeral para los vivos	Colombia	Pablo Agüero	Zona Audiovisual

[143] Completion data not compiled for projects from countries other than Mexico, with the exception of those completed with a Mexican producer or co-producer by the end of 2013, in which case they appear in the first section of Appendix K.

APPENDIX L: PROJECTS SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE 3RD ENCUENTRO IBEROAMERICANO DE COPRODUCCIÓN CINEMATOGRÁFICA, FESTIVAL INTERNACIONAL DE CINE EN GUADALAJARA, MEXICO, 2007

III Encuentro – Mexican Narrative Projects (Produced or Co-Produced)

Working Title	Country	Director	Producer and/or Production Company	Completed Title, Year, Country, Director[144]
Almar	Mexico	Jesús Mario Lozano	Xulp	Ventanas al mar (Window to the Sea), 2012, Mexico, Jesús Mario Lozano
Duermevela	Mexico	Maryse Sistach Perret	Tragaluz	
La cuarta compañía	Mexico/ Spain/ Argentina	Amir Galván	Spanda Films	
Señorita Zacatecas	Mexico/ USA	Director TBD	Deborah Calla / Calla Productions	
Sueños de cristal	Mexico	Ulises Guzmán Reyes	Araneda Films	
Te extraño	Mexico/ Argentina/ Uruguay	Fabián Enrique Hofman Schprejer	Arte Mecánica / BinCine / Lavorágine Films	Te extraño (I Miss You), 2010, Mexico/ Argentina/Uruguay, Fabián Hofman
Vaho	Mexico	Alejandro Gerber Bicecci		Vaho (Becloud), 2009, Mexico, Alejandro Gerber Bicecci

[144] In parallel to chapter content, completion data for this appendix is based on information available by end of year 2013.

III Encuentro – Additional Projects

Working Title	Country[145]	Director	Production Company
Corned Beef	Spain/ Uruguay	Federico Álvarez	Icónica
Del amor y otros demonios	Costa Rica/ Colombia	Hilda Hidalgo	Aliciafilms / Cecerola Films
El Chiqui	Argentina	Anna Valeria Roig	Azpeitiacine
Entre el dolor y la nada	Brazil/ Portugal/ Spain	Alberto Graça	MPC & Associados
Gasolina	Guatemala	Julio Hernández Cordón	Cohete Films
Karen llora en un bus	Colombia	Gabriel Rojas & Andrés Vera	La Caja Negra Producciones
La llaga	Paraguay	Marcelo Martinessi	Mira
La montaña	Brazil	Vicente Ferraz	Tres Mundos Producciones
La seguridad de los perros	Argentina	Jorge Gaggero	Aquafilms
La sociedad del semáforo	Colombia	Rubén Mendoza	Dia Fragma Grupo Cultural
Mal día para pescar	Uruguay/ Spain/ Germany	Álvaro Brechner	Expresso Films
Octubre	Peru	Diego Vega Vidal & Daniel Vega Vidal	Lucas Creative Co.
Peter Pan Kids	Cuba	Arturo Sotto	Productora Internacional ICAIC
Recursos humanos	Colombia	Jaime Escallon Buraglia	Babilla Cine
Yo mujer sola	Paraguay	Leticia Coronel	Enmarcha

[145] Completion data not compiled for projects from countries other than Mexico.

APPENDIX M: PROJECTS SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE 4TH ENCUENTRO IBEROAMERICANO DE COPRODUCCIÓN CINEMATOGRÁFICA, FESTIVAL INTERNACIONAL DE CINE EN GUADALAJARA, MEXICO, 2008

IV Encuentro – Mexican Narrative Projects (Produced or Co-Produced)

Working Title	**Country**[146]	**Director**	**Producer and/or Production Company**	**Completed Title, Year, Country, Director**[147]
Agua fría de mar	Costa Rica	Paz Fábrega	Temporal Films / Nicolás Celis	Agua fría de mar (Cold Water of the Sea), 2010, Costa Rica/France/ Spain/Netherlands/ Mexico, Paz Fábrega
¿Alguien ha visto a Lupita?	Mexico / Chile	Gonzalo Justiniano	Sahara Films / Daniel de la Vega / Altavista Films / Mónica Lozano	¿Alguien ha visto a Lupita? (Have You Seen Lupita?), 2011, Mexico/Chile/ Argentina/Germany/ USA, Gonzalo Justiniano
Ana	Mexico	Carlos Carrera / Enrique Navarrete	Lo Coloco Films / Pablo Baksht / ADN Films / Los Hijos de su Madre / Lulú Producciones / FIDECINE	
Así en la tierra (Deudores)	Mexico	Acán Coen Trueta	Fernando Gou / Sara Rubalcava	
Operación Baby	Mexico	José Luis Valle		

[146] Since this section of Appendix M includes projects completed with a Mexican producer or co-producer, the "Country" column clarifies which country was associated with the project at the time of acceptance to the Encuentro.

[147] In parallel to chapter content, completion data for this appendix is based on information available by end of year 2013.

Tanta agua	Uruguay	Ana Guevara / Leticia Jorge	Control Z Films / Agustina Chiarino / Fernando Epstein	Tanta agua (So Much Water), 2013, Uruguay/Mexico/ Netherlands/ Germany, Ana Guevara & Leticia Jorge
Vagar entre sombras	Mexico	Alan Coton	La Chancla Producciones / Spohie Avernin	

IV Encuentro – Additional Projects

Working Title	**Country[148]**	**Director**	**Producer and/or Production Company**
Cuba exxxtreme	Cuba	Jorge Molina	Uko Films / Hugo Koper
David y el gran río	Argentina/ Germany	Rubén Plataneo	Calanda Producciones / Virginia Giacosa / Mil Colores Media / Gúdula Meinzolt
El otro lado del sueño	Panama	Luis Pacheco	Jaguar Films / Luis Pacheco
Erase una vez un país	Mexico (Doc)[149]	Juan Carlos Rufo	La Media Luna Producciones / Juan Carlos Rulfo / Eugenia Montiel
Estado del tiempo	Argentina	Osvaldo Daicich	Urkofilms / Nuria Arnaud / Vanessa Lejardi
Fraylandia	Uruguay	Sebastián Mayayo / María Viera	Calderita Pictures / Ramiro Ozer Ami
García	Colombia	José Luis Rugeles	Rhayuela Films / Federico Durán
Grietas 1 - El chico que miente	Venezuela	Marite Ugas	Sudaca Films / Mariana Rondón
Juega vivo	Panama	Enrique Pérez	Ngobe Films / Irina Ruiz
Justicia universal... Un desesperante retroceso	Mexico (Doc)	Susana Erenberg	Organización Bias y Cortes / Nerio Barberis

[148] Completion data not compiled for projects from countries other than Mexico, with the exception of those completed with a Mexican producer or co-producer by the end of 2013, in which case they appear in the first section of Appendix M.

[149] Completion data not compiled for Mexican documentary films.

Las niñas	Costa Rica	Laura Astorga	
Latinos	Spain/ Colombia	Víctor Gaviria	El Baile Films / Enrique Gabriel
Locura transitoria	Nicaragua	Rossana Lacayo	Gota Films / Luciano Balducci / José Luis Herguedas
Nacidos bajo fuego	Colombia	Jairo Carillo	La Máquina Producciones/ Harold Trompetero
Nahuel, el submarino humano	Argentina	Fernando Díaz	Fernando Díaz
Normal Men Stay Home	Bolivia	Juan Carlos Valdivia	Cinenómada / Juan Carlos Valdivia / Gabriela Maire
Tenemos que hablar	Spain	Julia Solomonoff / Alicia Scherson / Mercedes Gaspar	Imval Producciones / Katrin Pors / Hugo Castro Fau
¡Y, sin embargo, volaremos!	Cuba	Juan Carlos Tabío	Marcela Arenas

APPENDIX N: PROJECTS SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE 5TH ENCUENTRO IBEROAMERICANO DE COPRODUCCIÓN CINEMATOGRÁFICA, FESTIVAL INTERNACIONAL DE CINE EN GUADALAJARA, MEXICO, 2009

V Encuentro – Mexican Narrative Projects (Produced or Co-Produced)

Working Title	Country	Director	Producer and/or Production Company	Completed Title, Year, Country, Director[150]
Años después (Years Later)	Mexico /Spain	Laura Gárdos Velo	Senderos Imagen / Ignacio Xavier Elizarrarás del Pozo	Años después (Years Later), 2012, Mexico/Spain, Laura Gárdos Velo
Asalto al cine (The Cinema Hold Up)	Mexico	Iria Gómez Concheiro	Ciudad Cinema / Ozcar Ramírez	Asalto al cine (The Cinema Hold Up), 2011, Mexico, Iria Gómez Concheiro
Cuidados intensivos (Intensive Care)	Mexico	Ramiro Medina-Flores	1910 Films / Ignacio Barba / Carlos García Campillo	
El clic... y cómo lograrlo (The Click... and How to Make It Happen)	Mexico	Patricia Arriaga Jordán	Nao Films / Patricia Arriaga Jordán / Pablo Buelna Serrano	
El lenguaje de los machetes (Machete Language)	Mexico	Kyzza Terrazas	Canana / Gerardo Naranjo	El lenguaje de los machetes (Machete Language), 2011, Mexico, Kyzza Terrazas
Jugar a ser grandes (Playing to Be Older)	Mexico	Ricardo Artesi	Ana de la Rosa Zamboni	

[150] In parallel to chapter content, completion data for this appendix is based on information available by end of year 2013.

V Encuentro – Additional Projects

Working Title	**Country**[151]	**Director**	**Producer and/or Production Company**
Agnus Dei, Cordero de Dios (Agnus Dei, God's Lamb)	Mexico (Doc)[152]	Sofía Alejandra Sánchez	Issa Guerra
Amartelo	Bolivia	Rodrigo Bellot	Verónica Córdova / Gerardo Guerra / Imagen Propia
Años luz (Light Years)	Argentina	Sabrina Farji	Hernán Findling / Zoelle Producciones
Cápsulas (Capsules)	Guatemala	Verónica Riedel	Juan Eduardo Sepúlveda / Melindrosa Films / Verónica Riedel Producciones
Criminal	Argentina	Miguel Cohan	Margarita Gómez
Crisis	Mexico (Doc)	Paul Leduc	Bertha Navarro / Salamandra Producciones
El dedo (The Finger)	Argentina	Sergio Teubal	Mariana Fonseca / Sebastián Aloi / Metrópolis Films
Il mondiale dimenticato (The Lost World Cup)	Italy	Lorenzo Garzella / Filippo Macelloni	Daniele Mazzocca / Verdeoro
El páramo	Colombia	Jaime Osorio Márquez	Federico Durán / Rhayuela Films
El vals del obrero (The Working Class Waltz)	Mexico (Doc)	Gerardo Soriano	Jaime Soriano / Artevisión
Espérame en el cielo, Capitán (Wait for Me in Heaven, Captain)	Colombia	Rodrigo Triana	Clara María Ochoa / CMO Producciones
Estaçao Liberdade (Freedom Station)	Brazil	Caito Ortiz	Francesco Civita / Prodigo Films
Filiberto	Puerto Rico	Leandro Fabrizi	Freddie Marrero Alfonso / Proyecto Chiringa

[151] Completion data not compiled for projects from countries other than Mexico.

[152] Completion data not compiled for Mexican documentary films.

La señora verde (The Green Lady)	Colombia	Director TBD	Rodrigo Guerrero / Dynamo Producciones
Las carpetas (The Files)	Puerto Rico	Maite Rivera Carbonell	Ramón Almodóvar / Cine Exportación
Melaza (Molasses)	Cuba	Carlos Lechuga	Claudia Calviño / Inti Herrera / Alejandro Burgués / Producciones de la 5ta Avenida
NN	Perú	Héctor Adrián Gálvez Campos	Héctor Adrián Gálvez Campos
O silencio das palavras (The Silent [sic] of Words)	Brazil	Laine Milan	Joao Roni García / TVI Cinema
Shot in Mexico	Mexico/USA (Doc)	Xóchitl Dorsey	Xóchitl Dorsey / Mónica Campbell
Sybila	Chile	Teresa Arrendondo	Jennifer Walton / Viviana Erpel / Lupe Films
Tren de cercanías (Suburban Train)	Spain	Agustín Crespi	Cristina Zumárraga Sirvent / Tormenta Films

APPENDIX O: PROJECTS SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE 6TH ENCUENTRO IBEROAMERICANO DE COPRODUCCIÓN CINEMATOGRÁFICA, FESTIVAL INTERNACIONAL DE CINE EN GUADALAJARA, MEXICO, 2010

VI Encuentro – Mexican Narrative Projects (Produced or Co-Produced)

Working Title	**Country**[153]	**Director**	**Producer and/or Production Company**	**Completed Title, Year, Country, Director**[154]
Amor y chocolate (Of Love and Chocolate)	Mexico/ Denmark	Emma Balcázar	Arte Mecánica Producciones / Ozcar Ramírez / Sandra Paredes	
Edgar niño (Edgar Child)	Mexico/ Argentina/ Spain	Gustavo Moheno	Boca del Cielo Producciones / Marco Antonio Salgado	
Farewell, Ferris Wheel	Mexico/ USA	Jamie Sisley & Miguel Martínez	Kola Pictures / Jamie Sisley	
La casa de las sombras (The House of Shadows)	Mexico	Carlos Eduardo Aguilar	Samurai Films / Abril Balderrama	
La cebra (The Zebra)	Mexico	José Fernando León	Cinemágico Producciones / Socorro Méndez / Jesús Bretón	La cebra (The Zebra), 2011, Mexico, Fernando Javier León Rodríguez
La delgada línea amarilla (The Thin Yellow Line)	Mexico	Celso García	Martini Shot / Araceli Velázquez	
La ley de la tierra (Land's Law)	Mexico/ Spain/ Venezuela	Fabrizio Prada	Prada Films / Raiza Díaz	

[153] Since this section of Appendix O includes projects completed with a Mexican producer or co-producer, the "Country" column clarifies which country was associated with the project at the time of acceptance to the Encuentro.

[154] In parallel to chapter content, completion data for this appendix is based on information available by end of year 2013.

La Sargento Matacho (Matacho)	Colombia/ Mexico/ Panama	William González	Enic Producciones / Alina Hleap / Alpha Acosta	
La sirga (The Towrope)	Colombia	William Vega	Contravia Films Ltda. / Oscar Ruiz Navia	La sirga (The Towrope), 2012, Colombia/Mexico/ France, William Vega
Mentiras al aire (The Will to Fly)	Mexico	Luis Eduardo Reyes	Magenta Films / Eugenia Montiel / Telber Gustavson	
Mi padre (My Father)	Mexico	Sebastián Silva Beard	La Nonna Films / Alejandra Ceballos / Antonio Fernández	
Poncho Balón (Poncho Ball)	Mexico	René Castillo	Cascarita Films / René Castillo	
Simón (Simon)	Mexico	Patricia Arriaga	Nao Films / Pablo Buelna	
Sin crímenes (Without Crimes)	Mexico	Bruno Madariaga	Malpasito Cine / Isabel Cristina Fregoso	

VI Encuentro – Additional Projects

Working Title	**Country[155]**	**Director**	**Producer and/or Production Company**
Clever	Uruguay	Federico Borgia & Guillermo Madeiro	
Con los pies en el cielo (With Both Feet in Heaven)	Chile	Pablo Mantillo Rayo	Jorge Olguín / Verónica Cid / Olguín Films
Cupuaçu	Brazil	Marcelo Müller	Pablo Torrencillas / TC Filmes

[155] Completion data not compiled for projects from countries other than Mexico, with the exception of those completed with a Mexican producer or co-producer by the end of 2013, in which case they appear in the first section of Appendix O.

El ocaso Kiliwa (Kiliwas at Dusk)	Mexico (Doc)[156]	Rodrigo Iturrialde	Rodrigo Iturrialde / César Talamantes / Mono Films / Talamante Pictures
Infancia clandestina (Clandestine Childhood)	Argentina	Benjamín Ávila	Luis Puenzo / Trimedia Films
Inmediat Santiago	Chile	Jean Pierre Sánchez	Federico Botto / Samuel León / Cinescape
Iris	México (Doc)	Andrés Villa	Juan Carlos Robles / Natalia Casanova / Gorila Audiovisual
La casa (The House)	Bolivia	Carina Oroza	Ramiro Fierro / Andrés Jauernick / Banda Imagen
La cosecha del mal (Harvest of Evil)	Colombia	Carlos Fernández de Soto	Carlos Fernández de Soto
Las flores del Pepe (Pepe's Flowers)	Uruguay	Ramiro Ozer Ami & Sebastián Mayayo	Ramiro Ozer Ami / Calderita Pictures
Los sonidos profundos (The Deep Sounds)	Spain/Peru	Javier Corcuera	Gervasio Iglesias / La Zanfoña Producciones
Mujeres desnudas persiguiendo a Ewan McGregor (Naked Women Chasing Ewan McGregor)	Spain	Santi Amodeo	Manuel Yebra / Cienfuegos Films & Management
Mujeres de la Revolución Mexicana (Women of the Mexican Revolution)	Mexico (Doc)	Ana Cruz	Marco Julio Linares / José Ramón Mikelajáuregui / AC Arte y Cultura en Movimiento
Polvo (Dust)	Guatemala/ Spain	Julio Hernández Cordón	Fernanda del Nido / Tic Tac Producciones

[156] Completion data not compiled for Mexican documentary films.

Showroom (Mock-up Apartment)	Argentina	Fernando Jorge Molnar	Nicolás Daniel Battle / Daniel Andrés Werner / Magoya Films
Tres buitres (Three Vultures)	Uruguay/ Spain	Álvaro Brechner	Virginia Hinze / Álvaro Brechner / Baobao Films / Expresso Films

APPENDIX P: PROJECTS SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE 7TH ENCUENTRO IBEROAMERICANO DE COPRODUCCIÓN CINEMATOGRÁFICA, FESTIVAL INTERNACIONAL DE CINE EN GUADALAJARA, MEXICO, 2011

VII Encuentro – Mexican Narrative Projects (Produced or Co-Produced)

Working Title	**Country**	**Director**	**Producer and/or Production Company**	**Completed Title, Year, Country, Director[157]**
Cuatro lunas (Four Moons)	Mexico	Sergio Tovar Velarde	Atko Films / Edgar Barrón	
Cumbres	Mexico	Gabriel Nuncio Flores	Aurora Dominicana / Israel Cárdenas Ramírez / Laura Amelia Guzmán	
Insurgentes malditos (The Insurgent Curse)	Mexico	Christopher Luna	Cinema Fantástico / Raymundo Pastor / Felipe Pérez	
Juan y Vanessa (Juan and Vanessa)	Mexico	Ianis Guerrero	Artepepan Films / Ixchel Coutiño / Charlotte Uzu	
Mala luz (Evil Light)	Mexico	Tony Wakefield	Rio Negro Producciones / Matthias Ehrenberg / Ricardo Kleinbaum	Entre sombras (Ghost Light), 2012, Mexico, Tony Wakefield
Sueño en otro idioma (I Dream in Another Language)	Mexico/ Holland	Ernesto Cabreras	Revolver Media Productions / Agencia Sha / Raymond Van Der Kaaij	
Un accidente (An Accident)	Mexico	Andrea Martínez Crowther	Arte Mecánica Producciones / Ozcar Ramírez	

[157] In parallel to chapter content, completion data for this appendix is based on information available by end of year 2013.

VII Encuentro – Additional Projects

Working Title	**Country**[158]	**Director**	**Producer and/or Production Company**
35 años no es nada (35 Means Nothing)	Argentina	Fernando Spiner	Pablo Salomón / Santiago Hadida / Boya Films
A full resolución (Full Resolution)	Venezuela	Carmen La Roche	Yolanda Carolina Romero / Productora Cinematográfica Zona Fílmica
A ras del cielo (Reaching the Sky)	Spain/ European Union	Horacio Alcalá	Carlos Batres / Cámara Boreal / FEDEC (European Federation of Professional Circus Schools)
El día fuera del tiempo (The Day Outside Time)	Argentina	Cristina Fasulino	Paula Grandio / Mandrágora Producciones
El novelista (The Novelist)	Chile	Mario Selim Alcayaga González	Pamela Karim Harder Santos / Mario Selim Alcayaga González / Soundtrack Films Ltda.
Eso que llaman amor (What They Called Love)	Colombia	Carlos César Arbeláez Álvarez	Julián Giraldo / RCN CINE / e-NNOVVA
Estación Desamparados (Desamparados Station)	Peru	Manuel Bauer	Manuel Bauer / Likay Producciones Audiovisuales
Filial	Ecuador	Mauricio Samaniego	Paul Venegas / Xanadu Film
Hermanitos (Little Brothers)	Chile	Andrés Waissbluth	Miguel Ángel Labarca / Retaguardia Films
Indio	Mexico (Doc)[159]	Patricia Carrillo Carrera	Patricia Carrillo Carrera / Nómada Films
Kandire. La tierra sin mal (Kandire. Land without Evil)	Bolivia	Juan Carlos Valdivia Flores	Gabriela Maire / Ximena Valdivia / Cinenómada

[158] Completion data not compiled for projects from countries other than Mexico.

[159] Completion data not compiled for Mexican documentary films.

Kaplan (Mr. Kaplan)	Uruguay/ Spain	Álvaro Brechner	Álvaro Brechner / Mariana Secco / Expresso Films
La casa más grande del mundo (The Greatest House in the World)	Guatemala	Alejo Crisóstomo	Ana Virginia Bojórquez / Prisma
Las niñas Quispe (The Quispe Girls)	Chile	Sebastián Sepúlveda	Juan Ignacio Correa / Juan de Dios Larraín / Fábula
Los caminos del viento (The Winds of Road [sic])	Uruguay	Gabriel Szollosy	Anna Jancsó / Librecine
Los hijos de Rouch (Sons of Rouch)	Peru/Spain	Carlos Chang Cheng	Piero Solari / Azul Profundo Films
María	Colombia	José Luis Rugeles Gracia	Federico Durán Amorocho / Steven Griseles / Rhayuela Cine
Matías el titiritero (Matias the Puppeteer)	Colombia	Libia Stella Gómez Díaz	Libia Stell Gómez Díaz / Laura Silva
Nieve en la Habana (Snow in Havana)	Colombia	Sergio Cabrera	Ramón Jimeno / A Cuatro Manos
Pena de muerte (Death Penalty)	Chile	Álvaro Díaz	María Paz Eberhard / Trébol 3 Producciones
Sokho	Spain	Marie Ka	Carmen de Miguel / Marie Ka / Costa Oeste Producciones
Una obra de teatro (The Play)	Colombia	Maria Gamboa	Daniel Garcia Diaz / Adriana Agudelo Moreno / Día Fragma Fábrica de Películas
Yes Way Jose	Colombia	Vlamyr Vizcaya	Vlamyr Vizcaya / El Tuerto Pictures

APPENDIX Q: PROJECTS SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION IN MORELIA LAB 2005, MEXICO CITY + FESTIVAL DE CINE INTERNACIONAL DE MORELIA, MEXICO

2005 Morelia Lab – Mexican Projects

Working Title	**Selection Designation**	**Producer**	**Completed Title, Year, Country, Director[160]**
Cantar de Machos Cabríos	Independent	Ivonne Cartas Czaplewaki	
Combustión espontánea	Centro de Capacitación Cinemato-gráfica (CCC)	Michel Grau	
Con la carne en la masa	Centro Universitario de Estudios Cinemato-gráficos (CUEC)	Oscar Serrano Zermeño	
Corazón del tiempo	University of Guadalajara, Audiovisual (UDG)	Isabel Fregoso	Corazón del tiempo (Heart of Time), 2009, Mexico/Spain, Alberto Cortés
Delirio	IMAGINA (Cineastas en Michoacán)	Claudia Florescano	
Deseos del corazón	Independent	Alejandra Liceaga Cevallos	
Día de muertos	UDG	Carlos Gutiérrez	
Donde estés	CUEC	Cecilia Girón Jiménez	
Efecto luna azul	Independent	Adriana Rosique Manjarrez	Kada kien su karma (To Each Their Own Karma), 2008, Mexico, Leon Serment
El rapto	UDG	Jorge Díaz Sánchez	
El vuelo del Pinocho	Independent	Lilia Soto Aragón	

[160] In parallel to chapter content, completion data for this appendix is based on information available by end of year 2013.

En clave de ciudad	Independent	Bernardo Jasso	
Epitafio	IMAGINA	Alma Fuertes	
Estación Tula	Gremio de Cineastas de Nuevo León	Miguel Arias	
Genoma	Independent	Victoria Lucero Ramírez Rodríguez	
Guadalupe Reina	IMAGINA	Rita Carolina Hernández Borja	
Hombre de una pieza	UDG	Araceli Velásquez	
Hoy por tí	CCC	Joaquín González	
Incisive Isabel	Independent	Roberto López Valencia	
Insectos	IMAGINA	Georgina Calvillo	
Instrumental	Gremio de Cineastas de Nuevo León	David De la Peña	
Jugar a ser Grandes	Independent	Estrella Araiza	
Júrame que no me olvidarás	CUEC	José Luis Valle González	
Kentucky Chansaw Massacre	CCC	Julio Bárcenas	
La caja de Lola	IMAGINA	Jesús Pimentel Melo	
La nostalgia del Tiburón	Independent	Oscar Uriel	
Lola y Lu	Independent	Alpha Acosta	
Los sueños de Alicia	Independent	Pedro Araneda Vázquez	
Mala madre	Independent	Patricia Rojas Bolaños-Cacho	
Mientras vivo	Independent	Paulino Hemmer	
Mira el cielo	UDG	Marcela Ponce	
Mundo nuevo	CCC	Abril Schmucler	
Naturalezas muertas	Independent	Linda Ramos	

Partes usadas	Independent	Elsa Reyes Garcés	Partes usadas (Used Parts), 2007, Mexico/ France/Spain, Aarón Fernández Lesur
Plata	Gremio de Cineastas de Nuevo León	Lesslye Yin Ramos	
Propiedad ajena	Independent	Marissa Gómez García	Propiedad ajena (The Land of Another), 2007, Mexico, Luis Vélez
Prueba Desconocida	Gremio de Cineastas de Nuevo León	Claudia Del Bosque López	
Recordar y vivir	CUEC	Martí Torrens del Sordo	
Semana Mayor	Gremio de Cineastas de Nuevo León	Janeth Aguirre	
Todos los días son tuyos	CUEC	Karl Lenin González Davis	Todos los días son tuyos (Every Day Is Yours), 2007, Mexico, José Luis Gutiérrez

APPENDIX R: PROJECTS SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION IN MORELIA LAB 2007, FESTIVAL DE CINE INTERNACIONAL DE MORELIA, MEXICO

2007 Morelia Lab – Mexican Projects (Produced or Co-Produced)

Working Title	**Country**[161]	**Producer**	**Completed Title, Year, Country, Director**[162]
Agua fría de mar	Costa Rica	María Paz Fábrega	Agua fría de mar (Cold Water of the Sea), 2010, Costa Rica/France/ Spain/Netherlands/ Mexico, Paz Fábrega
Al lado del camino	Mexico	Francisco Javier Padilla	
Amor a muerte	Mexico	Georgina Calvillo	
Andrómeda	Mexico	Germán Méndez	
Boca de Santos	Mexico	Antonio Sánchez	
Copia de Venus	Mexico	José Cristóbal Juárez Flores	
Flor de Fango	Mexico	Guillermo González Montes	Flor de Fango (Mud Flower), 2011, Mexico, Guillermo González
Fuera del closet	Mexico	Luis Monterrubio	
Happy Llantas	Mexico	Gabriela Ruvalcaba Rentería	
La balada de los incrédulos	Mexico	Mariana Paredes Peláez	
La Mil Traumas	Mexico	Ximena Urrutia Partida	
Le Petit Bleu	Mexico	José Antonio Arellano Valdez	
Nadie muere de amor	Mexico	Héctor Hernández Gutiérrez	
Pastorela	Mexico	Rodrigo Herranz Fanjul	Pastorela, 2011, Mexico, Emilio Portes
Rencor vivo	Mexico	Tonatihu Loza	
Restaurante	Mexico	Mónica Vargas Celis	
Se busca donador	Mexico	Blanca Álvarez	

[161] Since this section of Appendix R includes projects completed with a Mexican producer or co-producer, the "Country" column clarifies which country was associated with the project at the time of acceptance to Morelia Lab.

[162] In parallel to chapter content, completion data for this appendix is based on information available by end of year 2013.

Venenum	Mexico	Jessica Villegas Lattuada	
Vodka y Coca	Mexico	Christopher Luna	

2007 Morelia Lab – Additional Projects

Working Title	**Country**[163]	**Producer**
Americano del Sur	Venezuela	Aldrina Valenzuela
Cabeza rodante	Uruguay	Martín Klein
Carga sellada	Bolivia	Pilar Danica Valverde Stanbuk
Con el perdón de Dios	Ecuador	Víctor Rodrigo Cunalata
David y el gran río	Argentina	Virginia Giacosa
Dolores y Masferrer	Colombia	Sofía Isabel Guzmán Muñoz
El hombre de la cabeza de cartón	Brazil	Suzana Markus
Fruta seca	Peru	Ermesto Cabellos
Juega vivo	Panama	Irina Ruiz Figueroa
Lado ciego	Honduras	Silvia Raquel Fernández Andino
Mosaico	Chile	Gastón Chedufau
Pití	Dominican Republic	Roddy A. Pérez

[163] Completion data not compiled for projects from countries other than Mexico, with the exception of those completed with a Mexican producer or co-producer by the end of 2013, in which case they appear in the first section of Appendix R.

APPENDIX S: PROJECTS SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION IN MORELIA LAB 2009, FESTIVAL DE CINE INTERNACIONAL DE MORELIA, MEXICO

2009 Morelia Lab – Mexican Projects (Produced or Co-Produced)

Working Title	**Country**[164]	**Producer**	**Completed Title, Year, Country, Director**[165]
Agua va	Mexico	Joaquín González de la Vega	
Amantes en el Huracán	Mexico	Tonatihu Loza	
Caminando las noches	Mexico	Samuel Sosa	
Carmelita	Mexico	Carlos Mesta Casas	
Cielo abajo	Mexico	Lilia Deschamps	
Corcovada	Mexico	Bernardo González Burgos	
Cuidados intensivos	Mexico	Ignacio Barba	
Encuentro en Burgos	Mexico	Andrea Álvarez	
Fecha de caducidad	Mexico	Karla Uribe	Fecha de caducidad (Expiration Date), 2012, Mexico, Kenya Márquez
Gonzo	Mexico	Liliana Bravo	
It's a Wrap	Mexico	Rodrigo Sánchez Martínez	
La delgada línea amarilla	Mexico	Araceli Velázquez	
La habitación	Mexico	Edher Campos	
La máscara de jade	Mexico	Miguel Chehaibar	
Los fantasmas de las cosas por venir	Mexico	Fabiola Ramos Ramírez	
Los Sosa	Mexico	Ileana Guzmán Dávila	
Malibú	Mexico	Víctor Velázquez	
Mexican Dream	Mexico	Carlos García Campillo	
Monkey Island	Mexico	Susana Jacques	
Música de escape	Mexico	Viviana Motta Murguía	

[164] Since this section of Appendix S includes projects completed with a Mexican producer or co-producer, the "Country" column clarifies which country was associated with the project at the time of acceptance to Morelia Lab.

[165] In parallel to chapter content, completion data for this appendix is based on information available by end of year 2013.

Obispo verde	Mexico	Andrés Eichelman Kaiser	
Puerto Padre	Costa Rica	Gustavo Fallas	Puerto Padre (Port Father), 2013, Costa Rica/Mexico, Gustavo Fallas

2009 Morelia Lab – Additional Projects

Working Title	**Country**[166]	**Producer**
Cinema Árbol	Colombia	Carlos Alberto Mogollón Fuentes
De jueves a domingo	Chile	Macarena López
Encontrando a Paloma	Peru	Valeria Ruiz Salas
Jeque Mate	Venezuela	Bernardo Izsak
Lo peor de los deseos	Bolivia	Claudio Araya Silva
Lugar para tres	Brazil	Leonardo Maia
Melodrama	Brazil	Aleksei Abib
Morena	Dominican Republic	Desirée Díaz Silva
Solo	Uruguay	Juan José López
Stent	Argentina	Benjamín Domenech

[166] Completion data not compiled for projects from countries other than Mexico, with the exception of those completed with a Mexican producer or co-producer by the end of 2013, in which case they appear in the first section of Appendix S.

APPENDIX T: PROJECTS SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION IN MORELIA LAB 2011, FESTIVAL DE CINE INTERNACIONAL DE MORELIA, MEXICO

2011 Morelia Lab – Mexican Projects (Produced or Co-Produced)

Working Title[167]	Country	Producer
Bruno	Mexico	Carlos Ricardo Gómez Quiñones
Corazón de Mezquite	Mexico	Ana Laura Calderón
Cuatro Lunas	Mexico	Edgar Barrón
Edén	Mexico	Ramiro Ruiz Ruiz-Funes
Enséñame a seducir	Mexico	Santiago Reynoso Ortíz-Monasterio
Esperando a los bárbaros	Colombia/ Mexico	Alejandro Prieto
Haz por venir	Mexico	Socorro Méndez
La casa más grande del mundo	Mexico/ Guatemala	Sandra Paredes
La noche de Franco	Mexico	April Shannon
La palabra de Dios	Mexico	Izrael Moreno
La tierra sin mal	Mexico	Lilia Velazco Valle
Nadie sabrá nunca	Mexico	Ernesto Martínez Arévalo
Seguridad	Mexico	A Fernández
Temporada baja	Mexico	Nicolás Celis
Uncut	Mexico	Laura Pino
Vacía Casas	Mexico	Hatuey Lavielle
Vida con mi viuda	Mexico	Gabriela Olmedo

2011 Morelia Lab – Additional Projects

Working Title	Country[168]	Producer
Arupos Rotos	Ecuador	Isabella Parra
Blue Lips	Argentina	Candela Figueira
Disco virgen	Chile	Joy Catalina Penroz Yáñez

[167] Since none of these projects were completed within the study's timeframe, there is no completion data included in this appendix.

[168] Completion data not compiled for projects from countries other than Mexico.

Divine	Guatemala/ Chile	Alejo Cristóstomo
El hombre que mató a mi amada muerta	Brazil	Roberto Antonio Goncalves Jr.
La turista	Argentina	Daniel Andrés Werner
La virgen del hielo	Argentina	Francisco Larralde
Pampa	Argentina	Rosalía Ortiz de Zárate
Primate	Argentina	Cynthia Gabrenja
Única mirando al mar	Costa Rica	Nicole Maynard

Bibliography

"2002 Mexico Yearly Box Office Results." Box Office Mojo. IMDb.com. Web. 30 June 2013 <http://boxofficemojo.com/intl/mexico/yearly/?yr=2002&p=.htm>.

Acevedo-Muñoz, Ernesto R. Buñuel and Mexico: The Crisis of National Cinema. U of California P, 2003. eBook Collection (EBSCOhost). Web. 4 Jan. 2012.

Aldama, Frederick Luis. Mex-Ciné: Mexican Filmmaking, Production, and Consumption in the Twenty-First Century. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 2013. Print.

Alvarado, Eduardo. "¡Bravo, bravo, Alonso!" Reforma (Ciudad de México, Distrito Federal, Mexico) 29 July 2000: Gente 8. Access World News. NewsBank. Web. 18 Aug. 2013.

"Amar a morir: Foreign Total (2009)." Box Office Mojo. IMDb.com. Web. 03 Sept. 2012 <http://boxofficemojo.com/movies/intl/?page=&id=_fAMARAMORIR01>.

"'Amar a morir' es el Mejor Largometraje en el FICG." El Informador. Unión Editorialista, 27 Mar. 2009. Web. 02 Sept. 2013 <http://www.informador.com.mx/entretenimiento/2009/90021/6/amar-a-morir-es-el-mejor-largometraje-en-el-ficg.htm>.

"Amores perros (2001): Domestic Total Gross." Box Office Mojo. IMDb.com. Web. 29 June 2013 <http://boxofficemojo.com/movies/?id=amoresperros.htm>.

Aréchiga, Gustavo. "Más cine mexicano - 20 Festival Internacional de Cine en GDL. Sugieren cabezas de festivals extranjeros, que toda la producción mexicana anual se exhiba en el Festival tapatío." Mural (Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico) 19 Mar. 2005: Gente 7. Access World News. NewsBank. Web. 11 May 2014.

---. "Mexicanos a la baja - 20 Festival Internacional de Cine en GDL. Aumentan la bolsa de premios del Festival Internacional de Cine y abren la competencia al país el la sección iberoamericana." Mural (Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico) 1 Mar. 2005: Gente 1. Access World News. NewsBank. Web. 11 May 2014.

---. "Visitan este año el Festival 75 mil espectadores - 20 Festival Internacional de Cine en GDL." Mural (Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico) 19 Mar. 2005: Gente 1. Access World News. NewsBank. Web. 11 May 2014.

"Arráncame la vida, la cinta más cara de México." El Universal.mx. El Universal, 02 Sept. 2008. Web. 12 June 2016 <http://archivo.eluniversal.com.mx/notas/534950.html>.

Aviña, Rafael. "Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia: Una década." 2012. Email correspondence with Blas Valdez, FICM Film Program Management. 22 Jan. 2013.

Ayala Blanco, Jorge. La fugacidad del cine mexicano. Mexico City: Océano, 2001. Print.

Balio, Tino. "'A Major Presence in all of the World's Important Markets': The Globalization of Hollywood in the 1990s." The Film Cultures Reader. Ed. Graeme Turner. New York: Routledge, 2002. 206-17. Print.

Berg, Charles Ramirez. Cinema of Solitude: A Critical Study of Mexican Film, 1967-1983. Austin: U of Texas P, 1992. Print.

---. "El automóvil gris and the Advent of Mexican Classicism." Visible Nations: Latin American Cinema and Video. Ed. Chon A. Noriega. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2000. 3-32. Print.

Berjon, Jean-Christophe. "Hacer entrañable cada momento." Hacia los 10 años: Memorias de un espectador. Morelia Film Fest, n.d. Web. 04 Aug. 2014 <http://moreliafilmfest.com/?seccion=memorias-de-un-espectador&ficm_ediciones_tax=hacia-los-10-anos>.

Biskind, Peter. Down and Dirty Pictures: Miramax, Sundance, and the Rise of the Independent Film. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2004. Print.

---. Easy Riders, Raging Bulls: How the Sex-Drugs-and-Rock 'N' Roll Generation Saved Hollywood. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1998. Print.

"Blue Eyelids (2007): Company Credits." IMDbPro. IMDb.com. Web. 05 Oct. 2015 <https://pro-labs.imdb.com/title/tt0481320/companycredits>.

Bordwell, David. Narration in the Fiction Film. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1985. Print.

Bourdieu, Pierre. The Field of Cultural Production. New York: Columbia UP, 1993. Print.

Caballero, Jorge. "Estrenarán en Morelia cinta sobre la vida del escritor Fernando Vallejo." La Jornada en línea. DEMOS, 22 Sept. 2003. Web. 27 June 2014 <http://www.jornada. unam.mx/2003/09/22/06an1esp.php?>.

Cabrera, Omar. "Reconocen a mujeres en el cine." Reforma (Ciudad de México, Distrito Federal, Mexico) 15 Aug. 2001: Gente 11. Access World News. NewsBank. Web. 18 Aug. 2013.

"Carga Sellada | En Producción." Carga Sellada | Arte Mecánica. Arte Mecánica Producciones, n.d. Web. 09 Dec. 2015 <http://www.artemecanica.com/carga-sellada.html>.

Carrillo, Leticia. "Iván Trujillo, nuevo director del festival de Guadalajara." CorreCamara.com.mx. CorreCamara, 04 June 2010. Web. 11 Oct. 2013 <http://www.correcamara.com.mx/inicio/int.php?mod=noticias_detalle&id_noticia=1839>.

Chenillo, Mariana. Skype interview. 26 Apr. 2013.

"Chronicles (2004) [Crónicas]: Awards." IMDbPro. IMDb.com. Web. 25 May 2014 <http://pro.imdb.com/title/tt0382621/awards>.

"Cinco días sin Nora (2008): Company Credits." IMDbPro. IMDb.com. Web. 23 June 2014 <https://pro-labs.imdb.com/title/tt1143148/companycredits>.

Ciuk, Perla. "El Huapango que no bailan - Opinión." Reforma (Ciudad de México, Distrito Federal, Mexico) 28 Mar. 2003: Gente 8. Access World News. NewsBank. Web. 11 May 2014.

"Colaboradores: Fecha de Caducidad." Fecha de Caducidad Sitio Oficial. [Official Website for Expiration Date.] N.p., n.d. Web. 05 June 2015 <https://fechadecaducidadpelicula. wordpress.com/principales-colaboradores>.

Contreras, Héctor. "Asume Kenia [sic] Márquez dirección de la muestra - 17 muestra de cine mexicano: Renuncia Enrique Ortega a dirigir el Guadalajara Cinemafest; fungirá sólo como asesor." Mural (Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico) 29 Jan. 2002: Gente 1. Access World News. NewsBank. Web. 11 Oct. 2013.

---. "Da su primer paso." Mural (Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico) 9 March 2001: Gente 1. Access World News. NewsBank. Web. 11 Oct. 2013.

Curtin, Michael. "Thinking Globally: From Media Imperialism to Media Capital." Media Industries: History, Theory, and Method. Eds. Jennifer Holt and Alisa Perren. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. 108-19. Print.

Damerow, Harold. "Global North and Global South. Definitions." Union County College, 27 Aug. 2010. Web. 20 Aug. 2012 <http://faculty.ucc.edu/egh-damerow/global_south.htm>.

de la Fuente, Anna Marie. "At 20, Guadalajara Widens Its Global Scope." Variety. LexisNexis Academic. Load date 07 Mar. 2005. Web. 11 May 2014.

---. "Mexican Film Institute Imcine Reports Record 2015 Film Output." Variety.com. Variety, 07 Mar. 2016. Web. 06 Aug. 2016 <http://variety.com/2016/film/festivals/mexican-film-institute-imcine-record-2015-film-output-1201724069/>.

de Valck, Marijke, and Skadi Loist. "Film Festival Studies: An Overview of a Burgeoning Field." Film Festival Yearbook 1: The Festival Circuit. Eds. Dina Iordanova and Ragan Rhyne. St. Andrews, Scotland, UK: St. Andrews Film Studies, 2009. 179-215. Print.

Delgado, Humberto. "Algunos aspectos de las relaciones cinematográficas entre México y los Estados Unidos." ReVista (Film / Fall 2009). Cambridge: Harvard's David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies. Web. 21 June 2015 <http://revista.drclas.harvard.edu/book/algunos-aspectos-de-las-relaciones-cinematogr% C3%A1ficas-entre-m%C3%A9xico-y-los-estados-unidos>.

Díaz López, Marina. "¿Dónde están los hombres? Crisis de la masculinidad Mexicana en Y tu mamá también." Negociando identidades, traspasando fronteras: Tendencias en la literatura y el cine mexicanos en torno al nuevo milenio. Eds. Susanne Igler

and Thomas Stauder. Estudios latinoamericanos 49. Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2008. 137- 53. Print.

Díaz Rodríguez, Ózcar. "'Vaho,' marginada por los exhibidores nacionales." Noticias de IMCINE. IMCINE. 25 June 2010. Web. 27 June 2013 <http://www.imcine.gob.mx/vaho-marginada-por-los-exhibidores-nacionales.html>.

"Duck Season (2004) [Temporada de patos]: Awards." IMDbPro. IMDb.com. Web. 21 May 2014 <http://pro.imdb.com/title/tt0407246/awards>.

"El cine mexicano en NY." EsMas Cine. Comercio Mas, 29 Aug. 2011. Web. 31 Aug. 2011 <http://www2.esmas.com/entretenimiento/cine/325719/el-cine-mexicano-contemporaneo -gerardo-naranjo-y-matias-meyer-nueva-york-ciclo-genmex>.

"El crimen del Padre Amaro (2002): Domestic Total Gross." Box Office Mojo. IMDb.com. Web. 29 June 2013 <http://boxofficemojo.com/movies/?id=elcrimendelpadreamaro.htm>.

Elo Lagarde, José Antonio. Skype interview. 17 Jan. 2013.

"Entregó el FICG 82 mil pesos a siete instituciones filantrópicas de Guadalajara (Redacción)." La Jornada Michoacán. Editora de Medios de Michoacán. 26 June 2010. Web. 01 June 2014 <http://www1.lajornadamichoacan.com.mx/2010/06/26/index.php?section=cultura &article=010n2cul>.

"Exhiben trabajos 'cortos'." Reforma (Ciudad de México, Distrito Federal, Mexico) 16 July 2000: Gente 12. Access World News. NewsBank. Web. 18 Aug. 2013.

Expresión en Corto (EEC). Décimo Festival de Cine Expresión en Corto. Festival Catalog. San Miguel de Allende, Guanajuato: Expresión en Corto, 2007. Print.

---. Festival Internacional de Cine Expresión en Corto Guanajuato México 2010 [13th edition]. Festival Catalog. San Miguel de Allende, Guanajuato: Expresión en Corto, 2010. Print.

---. Festival Internacional de Cine Expresión en Corto 2008 [11th edition]. Festival Catalog. San Miguel de Allende, Guanajuato: Expresión en Corto, 2008. Print.

---. Octavo Festival Internacional de Cine Expresión en Corto. Festival Catalog. San Miguel de Allende, Guanajuato: Expresión en Corto, 2005. Print.

---. Programa Oficial 2009. Vol. 2 of 3 of the Festival Catalog for 9th edition of the Festival Internacional de Cine Expresión en Corto. San Miguel de Allende, Guanajuato: Expresión en Corto, 2009. Print.

---. "Contactos Finales Pitching 2006." Unpublished festival archival document in author's collection. Digital file. 10 Aug. 2006. Used with permission of Sarah Hoch.

---. "Informe final 4IPM." Coordinación del 4th International Pitching Market. Digital file. July 2007. Used with permission of Sarah Hoch.

---. Séptimo Festival Internacional de Cine Expresión en Corto. Festival Catalog. San Miguel de Allende, Guanajuato: Expresión en Corto, 2004. Print.

Falicov, Tamara L. "'Cine en Construcción' / 'Films in Progress': How Spanish and Latin American Filmmakers Negotiate the Construction of a Globalized Art-house Aesthetic." Transnational Cinemas 4 (2013): 253-71. Print.

---. "Migrating from South to North: The Role of Film Festivals in Funding and Shaping Global South Film and Video." Locating Migrating Media. Eds. Greg Elmer, et al. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2010. 3-21. Print.

"Fecha de caducidad (2012) [Expiration Date]: Awards." IMDbPro. IMDb.com. Web. 08 June 2015 <http://pro.imdb.com/title/tt2112148/awards>.

Fein, Seth. "From Collaboration to Containment: Hollywood and the International Political Economy of Mexican Cinema after the Second World War." Mexico's Cinema: A Century of Film and Filmmakers. Eds. Joanne Hershfield and David R. Maciel. Scholarly Resources, 1999. Lanham, MD: SR Books, 2005. 123-63. Print.

---. "Transcultured Anticommunism: Cold War Hollywood in Postwar Mexico." Visible Nations: Latin American Cinema and Video. Ed. Chon A. Noriega. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2000. 82-111. Print.

Feinstein, Howard. "10 Films to Watch from the Guadalajara Film Festival." Indiewire.com. SnagFilms, 19 Mar. 2010. Web. 20 Aug. 2012 <http://www.indiewire.com/article/10_films_to_watch_from_the_guadalajara_film_festival#>.

---. "Expiration Date." ScreenDaily.com. Media Business Insight Limited, 10 Dec. 2011. Web. 06 June 2015 <http://www.screendaily.com/reviews/the-latest/expiration-date/5035752. article>.

Feldman, Anastacia. "A Lesson in Arts Education." Shoot 44.34 (2003): 4. International Bibliography of Theatre and Dance. EBSCOhost. Web. 8 Apr. 2013.

"Festival cortometrajes homenajea a pioneras del cine mexicano." EFE News Services 26 July 2003. Access World News. NewsBank. Web. 21 Aug. 2013.

"Festival en corto se consolidó aunque pide apoyo para futuro." EFE News Services 27 July 2003. Access World News. NewsBank. Web. 21 Aug. 2013.

Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia (FICM). 5º Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia: Octubre 5-14, 2007. Festival Catalog. Morelia, Michoacán: FICM, 2007. Web. 06 July 2012 <http://www.moreliafilmfest.com/media/docs/catalogo-2007.pdf>.

---. 7º Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia: 3-11 octubre 2009. Festival Catalog. Morelia, Michoacán: FICM, 2009. Web. 06 July 2012 <http://www.moreliafilmfest.com/ media/docs/Ficm09_Cat_Lo.zip>.

---. 8º Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia: 16-24 octubre 2010. Festival Catalog. Morelia, Michoacán: FICM, 2010. Web. 06 July 2012 <http://www.moreliafilmfest.com/ media/docs/catalogo-2010.pdf>.

---. 9º Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia: 15-23 octubre 2011. Festival Catalog. Morelia, Michoacán: FICM, 2011. Web. 06 July 2012 <http://www.moreliafilmfest.com/media/docs/Ficm2011_Cat-pWeb_Sans-2.pdf>.

---. 10º Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia: 3-11 noviembre 2012. Festival Catalog. Morelia, Michoacán: FICM, 2012. Web. 03 Aug. 2014 <http://catalogos.moreliafilmfest. com/pdf/catalogo_2012.pdf>.

---. 11º Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia: 18-27 octubre 2013. Festival Catalog. Morelia, Michoacán: FICM, 2013. Web. 03 Aug. 2014 <http://catalogos.moreliafilmfest.com/ pdf/catalogo_2013_1_3.pdf>.

---. IV Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia: Del 14 al 22 de octubre, 2006. Festival Catalog. Morelia, Michoacán: FICM, 2006. Web. 03 Aug. 2014 <http://catalogos. moreliafilmfest.com/pdf/catalogo_2006.pdf>.

---. Official Website. Morelia, Michoacán: FICM, 2012. Web. July 2012 <http://www.moreliafilmfest.com>.

---. Primer Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia: Del 3 al 10 de octubre, 2003. Festival Catalog. Morelia, Michoacán: FICM, 2003. Web. 03 Aug. 2014 <http://catalogos.moreliafilmfest.com/pdf/catalogo_2003.pdf>.

---. Segundo Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia: Del 1 al 9 de octubre, 2004. Festival Catalog. Morelia, Michoacán: FICM, 2004. Web. 03 Aug. 2014 <http://catalogos.moreliafilmfest.com/pdf/catalogo_2004.pdf>.

---. Sexto Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia: 4 al 12 de octubre, 2008. Festival Catalog. Morelia, Michoacán: FICM, 2008. Web. 06 July 2012 <http://www.moreliafilmfest.com/media/docs/catalogo-2008.pdf>.

---. Tercer Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia: 8 al 16 de octubre, 2005. Festival Catalog. Morelia, Michoacán: FICM, 2005. Web. 06 July 2012 <http://www.moreliafilmfest.com/media/docs/catalogo-2005.pdf>.

Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara (FICG). "I Encuentro Iberoamericano de Coproducción Cinematográfica: Proyectos participantes." Guadalajara Cinema Fest, n.d. Web. 23 Apr. 2012 <http://www.guadalajaracinemafest08.com/ downloads/Proyectos-I%20Encuentro.doc>.

---. "II Encuentro Iberoamericano de Coproducción Cinematográfica: Proyectos participantes." Guadalajara Cinema Fest, n.d. Web. 23 Apr. 2012 <http://www.guadalajaracinemafest08.com/downloads/Proyectos-II%20Encuentro.doc>.

---. "IV Encuentro Iberoamericano de Coproducción Cinematográfica: Proyectos participantes." Guadalajara Cinema Fest, n.d. Web. 23 Apr. 2012 <http://www.guadalajaracinemafest08.com/downloads/Proyectos-IV%20Encuentro.doc>.

---. Catálogo del FICG26, Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara. Festival Catalog 25 Mar. - 01 Apr. 2011. Guadalajara, Jalisco: FICG, 2011. Print.

---. "Contactos." 3er Mercado de Cine Iberoamericano en Guadalajara; I Encuentro Iberoamericano de Coproducción Cinematográfica. 194-223. Guadalajara, Jalisco: FICG, 2005. Email correspondence with Andrea Stavenhagen. 03 Sept. 2013.

---. "Dossier FICG Español 2010: Encuentro Iberoamericano de Coproducción Cinematográfica: Proyectos participantes." Email correspondence with Andrea Stavenhagen. 17 Sept. 2013.

---. FICG24 Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara: Industria / Industry. Industry Catalog 19-27 Mar. 2009. Guadalajara, Jalisco: FICG, 2009. Print.

---. FICG25 Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara. Festival Catalog 12-19 Mar. 2010. Guadalajara, Jalisco: FICG, 2010. Print.

---. FICG25 Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara: Industria / Industry. Industry Catalog 12-19 Mar. 2010. Guadalajara, Jalisco: FICG, 2010. Print.

---. FICG26 Agenda Industria. Industry Agenda. Mar. 2011. Guadalajara, Jalisco: FICG, 2011. Print.

---. FICG26 Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara: Industria / Industry. Industry Catalog 25 Mar. - 01 Apr. 2011. Guadalajara, Jalisco: FICG, 2011. Print.

---. FICG27 Agenda Industria. Industry Agenda. Mar. 2012. Guadalajara, Jalisco: FICG, 2012. Print.

---. FICG29 Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara. Festival Catalog 21-30 Mar. 2014. Guadalajara, Jalisco: FICG, 2014. Print.

---. FICG29: Industria / Industry. Industry Catalog 21-30 Mar. 2014. Guadalajara, Jalisco: FICG, 2014. Print.

---. "Informe y actividades Encuentro 2005." Coordinación Ejecutiva del I Encuentro Iberoamericano de Coproducción Cinematográfica. Apr. 2005. Email correspondence with Andrea Stavenhagen. 03 Sept. 2013.

---. "Informe y actividades Encuentro 2007." Coordinación Ejecutiva del III Encuentro Iberoamericano de Coproducción Cinematográfica. Apr. 2007. Email correspondence with Andrea Stavenhagen. 03 Sept. 2013.

---. Official Website. Guadalajara, Jalisco: PFICG, 2014. Web. Feb. 2014 <https://www.ficg.mx>.

---. "Participantes III Encuentro de Coproducción 2007." Coordinación Ejecutiva del III Encuentro Iberoamericano de Coproducción Cinematográfica. Apr. 2007. Email correspondence with Andrea Stavenhagen. 03 Sept. 2013.

---. "Patronato del Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara." Official Website. Guadalajara, Jalisco: PFICG, 2014. Web. Feb. 2014 <https://www.ficg.mx/29/index.php/es/el-festival/ficg>.

Festival Internacional de Cine Guanajuato International Film Festival (GIFF). Creatividad para encontrar nuevos mecanismos que fortalezcan el quehacer cinematográfico. San Miguel de Allende, Guanajuato: GIFF, 2012. Print.

---. Festival Internacional de Cine Guanajuato International Film Festival [14th edition]. Festival Catalog. San Miguel de Allende, Guanajuato: GIFF, 2011. Print.

---. Industria/Industry 2012. Industry Catalog to accompany the 14th GIFF. San Miguel de Allende, Guanajuato: GIFF, 2012. Print.

---. Official Website. San Miguel de Allende, Guanajuato: GIFF, 2012. Web. July 2012 <http://www.guanajuatofilmfestival.com>.

---. "Quienes somos." Official Website. San Miguel de Allende, Guanajuato: GIFF, 2013. Web. July 2013 <http://www.giff.mx/?page_id=2>.

---. Supporting the Creation of a Solid Film Industry. San Miguel de Allende, Guanajuato: GIFF, 2012. Print.

"Ficha Técnica: Fecha de Caducidad." Fecha de Caducidad Sitio Oficial. [Official Website for Expiration Date.] N.p., n.d. Web 05 June 2015 <https://fechadecaducidadpelicula. wordpress.com/ficha-tecnica>.

Finney, Angus. The International Film Business: A Market Guide Beyond Hollywood. London: Routledge, 2010. Print.

Fiorin, Sandro. Message to the author. 21 Aug. 2013. E-mail.

Foster, David William. Mexico City in Contemporary Mexican Cinema. Austin: U of Texas P, 2002. Print.

Fuchs, Andreas. "Global family: Cinepolis' Alejandro Ramirez Discusses Outreach and Opportunity." Film Journal International. Film Journal International, 15 Apr. 2013. Web. 29 June 2014 <http://www.filmjournal.com/filmjournal/content_display/news-and-features/features/cinemas/e3i647f3e5c89c4b75ca0c5ce063d0334fc>.

García, Gustavo A. "In Quest of a National Cinema: The Silent Era." Mexico's Cinema: A Century of Film and Filmmakers. Eds. Joanne Hershfield and David R. Maciel. Scholarly Resources, 1999. Lanham, MD: SR Books, 2005. 5-16. Print.

García, Juan Manuel. "Estrenan 'Así es la Vida'." Mural (Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico) 30 July 2000: Gente 5. Access World News. NewsBank. Web. 18 Aug. 2013.

---. "Muestran su cine 'en corto'." Mural (Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico) 9 July 2000: Gente 7. Access World News. NewsBank. Web. 19 Aug. 2013.

García Tsao, Leonardo. "Los años del resurgimiento." Introduction. Las rutas del cine mexicano contemporáneo 1990-2006. By Carla González Vargas. Mexico City: Landucci, 2006. 8-25. Print.

Gerber Bicecci, Alejandro. Skype interview. 11 Jan. 2013.

"Glamur y combate en el Festival Internacional de Cine de Morelia." El Universal [Mexico City]. 02 Nov. 2012. Latin American Newstand. ProQuest. Web. 13 Oct. 2014.

Gomery, Douglas. "Hollywood Corporate Business Practice and Periodizing Contemporary Film History." Contemporary Hollywood Cinema. Eds. Steve Neale and Murray Smith. New York: Routledge, 1998. 47-57. Print.

---. "The Hollywood Film Industry: Theatrical Exhibition, Pay TV, and Home Video." Who Owns the Media? Competition and Concentration in the Mass Media Industry. Eds. Benjamin M. Compaine and Douglas Gomery. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2000. Print.

González, Enrique. "Afinan la puntería para abarcar el mundo - Muestra de Cine Mexicano. Convertirse en el centro de venta y distribución más importante para las películas de la región es el objetivo del Primer Mercado de Cine Iberoamericano." Reforma (Ciudad de México, Distrito Federal, Mexico) 20 Mar. 2003: Toma 18, 2. Access World News. NewsBank. Web. 11 May 2014.

---. "Busca romper esquemas - 17 Muestra de Cine Mexicano Kenya Márquez, la directora más joven que ha tenido la Muestra de Cine Mexicano en Guadalajara, está preparada para los sabores y sinsabores propios del puesto." Mural (Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico) 18 Feb. 2002: Gente 1. Access World News. NewsBank. Web. 11 Oct. 2013.

González Vargas, Carla. Las rutas del cine mexicano contemporáneo 1990-2006. Mexico City: Landucci, 2006. Print.

Gore, Chris. The Ultimate Film Festival Survival Guide. 3rd ed. Hollywood: Lone Eagle, 2004. Print.

---. Chris Gore's Ultimate Film Festival Survival Guide: The Essential Companion for Filmmaker and Festival-Goers. 4rd ed. New York: Watson-Guptil, 2009. Print.

"Guadalajara Aiming at World Latin Reference." Filmfestivals.com. M21 Entertainment or contributing members, 2006 - 2012. Web. 11 Oct. 2013. <http://www.filmfestivals.com/blog/editor/guadalajara_aiming_at_world_latin_reference>.

"Guanajuato International Film Festival 2011." Short Notice. Dir. and Prod. Chris Miller. Shorts HD. 01 Sept. 2011. Vimeo. Web. 28 Aug. 2013 <https://vimeo.com/29263649>.

"Gusta 'De la Calle' a los tapatios." El Norte (Monterrey, Nuevo León, Mexico) 16 Mar. 2001: Gente 10. Access World News. NewsBank. Web. 11 Oct. 2013.

Gutiérrez, Carlos A., and Monika Wagenberg. "Meeting Points: A Survey of Film Festivals in Latin America." Transnational Cinemas 4 (2013): 295-305. Print.

Gutiérrez, Vicente. "México hace más cine del que se ve." ElEconomista.mx. El Economista, 28 March 2012. Web. 30 March 2012 <http://eleconomista.com.mx/entretenimiento/ 2012/03/28/mexico-hace-mas-cine-que-se-ve>.

Hacia los 10 años. Morelia Film Fest, n.d. Web. 04 Aug. 2014 <http://moreliafilmfest.com/?seccion=historias-de-un-festival&ficm_ediciones_ tax=hacia -los-10-anos>.

"Harrison Reiner: NALIP LWL Mentor Wins at Santa Barbara Int. Film Fest." NALIP eNewsletter 6 Feb. 2009. Web. 16 Aug. 2013 <http://nalip.org/files/past_editions/ 1326831562.html>.

Hecht, John. "'Alamar' Tops Morelia Film Festival." HollywoodReporter.com 10 Oct. 2009. VNU Business Media. LexisNexis. Web. 05 Oct. 2014.

---. "Dark Horse Drama Wins Morelia Fest." HollywoodReporter.com 15 Oct. 2007. VNU Business Media. LexisNexis. Web. 04 Oct. 2014.

---. "'Orphanage' to Open Mexico's Morelia Fest." HollywoodReporter.com 25 Oct. 2012. VNU Business Media. LexisNexis. Web. 04 Oct. 2014.

---. "Pablo Larrain's 'No' to Kick Off Morelia Film Fest." HollywoodReporter.com 27 Sept. 2007. VNU Business Media. LexisNexis. Web. 05 Oct. 2014.

Herranz Fanjul, Rodrigo. Skype interview. 29 Jan. 2013.

Hershfield, Joanne. "Race and Ethnicity in the Classical Cinema." Mexico's Cinema: A Century of Film and Filmmakers. Eds. Joanne Hershfield and David R. Maciel. Scholarly Resources, 1999. Lanham, MD: SR Books, 2005. 81-100. Print.

Hilgers, Mathieu, and Eric Mangez. "Introduction to Pierre Bourdieu's Theory of Social Fields." Bourdieu's Theory of Social Fields: Concepts and Applications. Eds. Mathieu Hilgers and Eric Mangez. New York: Routledge, 2015. 1- 35. Academia.edu. Web. 17 Aug. 2016 <https://www.academia.edu/8252418/_2014_ Introduction_to_Pierre_Bourdieu_s_theory_of_social_fields_in_M._Hilgers_et_E ._Mangez_Field_Theory._Concepts_and_applications_Routledge_Advances_in_ Sociology_1-36._with_M._Hilgers_>.

"History." Festival Internacional de Cine en Guadalajara. XXIII Guadalajara International Film Festival, 2008. Web. 08 July 2012 <http://www.jhcnewmedia.org/guadalajara/en/ ?page_id=20>.

Hoch, Sarah. Personal interview. 11 June 2004.

---. Skype interview. 04 April 2013.

---. "Un largo camino sin atajos." Partículas de luz: El cine se encuentra en Guanajuato. San Miguel de Allende, Guanajuato: Fundación Expresión en Corto, 2012. 34-40. Print.

Holt, Jennifer. "In Deregulation We Trust: The Synergy of Politics and Industry in Reagan-Era Hollywood." Film Quarterly (Winter 2001). Findarticles.com. Web. 28 Mar. 2004 <http://www.findarticles.com/cf_dls/m1070/2_55/83477537/p1/article.jhtml>.

Hopewell, John. "HBO Latino Has Pay TV rights Stateside." Variety.com. Variety, 27 Nov. 2010. Web. 23 June 2014 <http://variety.com/2009/biz/news/menemsha-nabs-nora-s-will-in-u-s-1118011875/>.

Huerta, César. "Buscan en Morelia coproducir con Europa." Reforma 09 0ct. 2005. Latin American Newstand. ProQuest. Web. 22 Dec. 2014.

---. "Ganan extranjeros festival de cortos - Trabajos nacionales sólo reciben 5 premios en Expresión en Corto celebrado en Guanajuato." El Norte (Monterrey, Nuevo León, Mexico) 28 July 2003. Access World News. NewsBank. Web. 21 Aug. 2013.

---. "La nueva joya del cine nacional." El Universal.mx. El Universal, 17 Dec. 2011. Web. 05 June 2015 <http://www.eluniversal.com.mx/espectaculos/109836.html>.

---. "Se retira de festival fílmico." El Universal.mx. El Universal, 10 Mar. 2007. Web. 18 May 2014 <http://www.eluniversal.com.mx/espectaculos/75113.html>.

Igler, Susanne, and Thomas Stauder, eds. Negociando identidades, traspasando fronteras: Tendencias en la literatura y el cine mexicanos en torno al nuevo milenio. Estudios latinoamericanos 49. Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2008. Print.

Imperiale, Laura. Skype interview. 30 Apr. 2013.

Iordanova, Dina. "The Film Festival Circuit." Film Festival Yearbook 1: The Festival Circuit. Eds. Dina Iordanova and Ragan Rhyne. St. Andrews, Scotland, UK: St. Andrews Film Studies, 2009. 23-39. Print.

Iordanova, Dina, and Ruby Cheung. Film Festival Yearbook 2: Film Festivals and Imagined Communities. St. Andrews, Scotland, UK: St. Andrews Film Studies, 2010. Print.

Iordanova, Dina, and Ragan Rhyne. Film Festival Yearbook 1: The Festival Circuit. St. Andrews, Scotland, UK: St. Andrews Film Studies, 2009. Print.

---. “Introduction.” Film Festival Yearbook 1: The Festival Circuit. Eds. Dina Iordanova and Ragan Rhyne. St. Andrews, Scotland, UK: St. Andrews Film Studies, 2009. 1-5. Print.

Iordanova, Dina, and Leshu Torchin. Film Festival Yearbook 4: Film Festivals and Activism. St. Andrews, Scotland, UK: St. Andrews Film Studies, 2012. Print.

Jacobson, Harlan. “Every Picture Tells a Story.” Film Comment 45.1 (2009): 20-21. Print.

James, Nick. “A Collective Embrace: Morelia Film Festival 2012.” Sight & Sound. 23 April 2014 updated from Feb. 2013. Web. 30 Aug. 2014 <http://www.bfi.org.uk/news-opinion/sight-sound-magazine/comment/festivals/collective-embrace-morelia-film-festival-2012>.

---. “Mexico Rising.” Sight & Sound 16.1 (2006): 24-27. Humanities Full Text (H.W. Wilson). EBSCOhost. Web. 30 Aug. 2014.

King, Geoff. American Independent Cinema. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2005. Print.

---. Indiewood, USA: Where Hollywood Meets Independent Cinema. London: I.B. Taurus, 2009. Print.

King, John. Magical Reels: A History of Cinema in Latin America. New York: Verso, 2000. Print.

Koehler, Robert. “Cinephilia and Film Festivals.” Dekalog 3: On Film Festivals. Ed. Richard Porton. New York: Wallflower, 2009. 81-97. Print.

---. “Festivals: Robert Koehler on Guadalajara.” Filmcomment.com. Film Society of Lincoln Center, 19 Mar. 2012. Web. 11 Oct. 2013 <http://www.filmcomment.com/blog/festivals-robert-koehler-on-guadalajara/>.

---. “Michoacan Mission: Fest Traveler: Morelia Film Festival.” Variety.com. Variety, 10 Oct. 2011. Web. 10 July 2012 <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1118043567>.

“La década del Festival de Cine de Morelia.” El Economista [Mexico City]. 26 Oct. 2012. Latin American Newstand. ProQuest. Web. 13 Oct. 2014.

“La Directora: Fecha de Caducidad.” Fecha de Caducidad Sitio Oficial. [Official Website for Expiration Date.] N.p., n.d. Web 05 June 2015 <https://fechadecaducidadpelicula.wordpress.com/biografia-y-filmografia-de-la-directora>.

Lauer, Jean Anne. “From ‘Expresión en Corto’ to Guanajuato International Film Festival: The Rise of Regional Support for Mexican Cinema in National and International Contexts.” Transnational Cinemas. 4 (2013): 273-93.

---. “Morelia Lab: Cultivando el oficio, elevando el perfil del productor.” Morelia Lab 10 Años: Taller de formación y actualización para productores latinoamericanos.

Morelia Lab. Instituto Mexicano de Cinematografía. Mexico City: IMCINE, 2014. 10-11. Print.

Lebrija, Fernando. Skype interview. 15 Jan. 2013.

---. Skype interview. 28 Aug. 2013.

Lenti, Paul. Rev. of Amber (Amber), dir. Luis Estrada. Variety. LexisNexis Academic. Load date 24 June 1994. Web. 01 Mar. 2014.

---. Rev. of Bienvenido - Welcome, dir. Fernando Sarinana. Variety. LexisNexis Academic. Load date 24 June 1994. Web. 01 Mar. 2014.

---. Rev. of Deserts Seas (Desiertos Mares), dir. Jose Luis Garcia Agraz. Variety. LexisNexis Academic. Load date 24 June 1994. Web. 01 Mar. 2014.

---. Rev. of Phantoms in Love (Amorosos Fantasmas), dir. Jose Luis Garcia Agraz. Variety. LexisNexis Academic. Load date 24 June 1994. Web. 01 Mar. 2014.

---. Rev. of The Dirigible (El Dirigible), dir. Pablo Dotta. Variety. LexisNexis Academic. Load date 24 June 1994. Web. 01 Mar. 2014.

---. Rev. of 'Til Death (Hasta Morir), dir. Gabriel Retes. Variety. LexisNexis Academic. Load date 24 June 1994. Web. 01 Mar. 2014.

"Llega 'La brújula la lleva el muerto' a la cartelera comercial." El Informador. Unión Editorialista, 28 Feb. 2013. Web. 01 July 2013 <http://www.informador.com.mx/entretenimiento/2013/440850/6/llega-la-brujula-la-lleva-el-muerto-a-la-cartelera-comercial.htm>.

Loist, Skadi, and Marijke de Valck. "Thematic Bibliography on Film Festival Research: Update 2011." Eds. Dina Iordanova and Leshu Torchin. Film Festival Yearbook 4: Film Festivals and Activism. St. Andrews, Scotland, UK: St. Andrews Film Studies, 2012. 303-15. Print.

López, Ana M. "A Cinema for the Continent." The Mexican Cinema Project. Eds. Chon A. Noriega and Steven Ricci. Los Angeles: UCLA Film and Television Archive, 1994. 7-12. Print.

López Portillo Villegas, Silvestre. "15 años de experiencias ... en corto." Partículas de luz: El cine se encuentra en Guanajuato. San Miguel de Allende, Guanajuato: Fundación Expresión en Corto, 2012. 76-82. Print.

López Riestra, Sol. "Premiación en Corto en el Festival de Guanajuato (videos)." Movimiento Cultural Techo Blanco, n.d. OoCities.org. Web. 19 Aug. 2013 <http://www.oocities.org/techoblancomx/premiacion.html>.

Maciel, David R. "Cinema and the State in Contemporary Mexico, 1970-1999." Mexico's Cinema: A Century of Film and Filmmakers. Eds. Joanne Hershfield and David R. Maciel. Scholarly Resources, 1999. Lanham, MD: SR Books, 2005. 197-232. Print.

---. “El Imperio de la Fortuna: Mexico’s Contemporary Cinema, 1985-1992.” The Mexican Cinema Project. Eds. Chon A. Noriega and Steven Ricci. Los Angeles: UCLA Film and Television Archive, 1994. 33-44. Print.

Maciel, David R., and Joanne Hershfield. “Women and Gender Representation in the Contemporary Cinema of Mexico.” Mexico’s Cinema: A Century of Film and Filmmakers. Eds. Joanne Hershfield and David R. Maciel. Scholarly Resources, 1999. Lanham, MD: SR Books, 2005. 249-65. Print.

MacLaird, Misha. Aesthetics and Politics in the Mexican Film Industry. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. Print.

“‘Mago,’ ‘Cronicas’ Win Top Honors at Guadalajara Fest.” Hollywood Reporter. 19 Mar. 2005. IMDb News. IMDb.com. Web. 25 May 2014 <http://www.imdb.com/news/ni0205041/>.

Márquez, Carlos F. “Podemos vivir sin el cine, pero no sin la literatura, confiesa Arthur Penn.” La Jornada Michoacán. DEMOS, 13 Oct. 2007. Web. 05 Oct. 2014 <http://www.jornada.unam.mx/2007/10/13/index.php?section=espectaculos&article=a09n1esp>.

Márquez, Kenya. Skype interview. 17 May 2013.

Martín, Cristina. “Veinte años no es nada.” XX años de cine mexicano en Guadalajara 1986-2005. Guadalajara, Mexico: Patronato de la Muestra de Cine Mexicano en Guadalajara, 2005. 11-15. Print.

Martin, Michael T. “The Unfinished Social Practice of the New Latin American Cinema: Introductory Notes.” Theory, Practices, and Transcontinental Articulations. Vol. 1 of New Latin American Cinema. 2 Vols. Ed. Michael T. Martin. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1997. 15-29. Print.

Martínez, Carolina. “Cuatro tapatíos compiten en Morelia - García, Orozco, Méndez y Patiño llevan sus cortos al Festival de Cine en Morelia.” Mural (Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico) 21 Sept. 2006: Gente 1. Access World News. NewsBank. Web. 02 Sept. 2014.

Martínez Ríos, Andrés. Message to the author. 19 Aug. 2012. E-mail.

Medina, Manuel F. “La ciudad como espacio público y privado en Solo con tu pareja [sic] y Vivir mata.” Negociando identidades, traspasando fronteras: Tendencias en la literatura y el cine mexicanos en torno al nuevo milenio. Eds. Susanne Igler and Thomas Stauder. Estudios latinoamericanos 49. Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2008. 137- 53. Print.

“Meet the Head of Juan Pérez (2008) [Conozca la cabeza de Juan Pérez]: Release Details.” IMDbPro. IMDb.com. Web. 24 May 2015 <https://pro-labs.imdb.com/title/ tt0809920/details>.

México. Cineteca Nacional México. "La Muestra Internacional de Cine de la Cineteca llega a sus 55 ediciones." 29 Oct. 2013. Mexico City: FIDEICOMISO para La Cineteca Nacional, 2013. Web. 07 Feb. 2014 <http://www.cinetecanacional.net/controlador.php?opcion =noticias&id=431>.

México. Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes (CONACULTA) and Instituto Mexicano de Cinematografía (IMCINE). Cinema México. Producciones 2006-2008. Mexico City: CONACULTA, IMCINE, 2008. Print.

---.---. Cinema México. Producciones 2007-2009. Mexico City: CONACULTA, IMCINE, 2009. Print.

---.---. Cinema México. Producciones 2008-2010. Mexico City: CONACULTA, IMCINE, 2010. Print.

---.---. Cinema México. Producciones 2010-2012. Mexico City: CONACULTA, IMCINE, 2012. Print.

México. Instituto Mexicano de Cinematografía (IMCINE). Anuario Estadístico de Cine Mexicano 2010 / Mexican Cinema Statistical Yearbook 2010. Mexico City: IMCINE, 2011. Print.

---. ---. Anuario Estadístico de Cine Mexicano 2011 / Statistical Yearbook of Mexican Cinema 2011. Mexico City: IMCINE, 2012. Print.

---. ---. Anuario Estadístico de Cine Mexicano 2012 / 2012 Statistical Yearbook of Mexican Cinema. Mexico City: IMCINE, 2013. Print.

---. ---. Anuario Estadístico de Cine Mexicano 2013 / 2013 Statistical Yearbook of Mexican Cinema. Mexico City: IMCINE, 2014. Web. 05 Sept. 2014 <http://www.imcine.gob.mx/cine-mexicano/publicaciones/anuario-estadistico>.

---. ---. Anuario Estadístico de Cine Mexicano 2014 / 2014 Statistical Yearbook of Mexican Cinema. Mexico City: IMCINE, 2015. Web. 14 June 2015 <http://www.imcine.gob.mx/cine-mexicano/publicaciones/anuario-estadistico>.

---. ---. "Costo promedio por película." 2010-2011. Web. 10 May 2012 <http://www.imcine.gob.mx/costo-promedio-por-pelcula.html>.

---. ---. "Fondo de inversión y estímulos al cine (FIDECINE); Largometrajes Cinematográficos aprobados para recibir apoyo 2002-2010 (Al 31 de diciembre)." Fidecine. 2010-2011. Web. 24 March 2012 <http://www.imcine.gob.mx/fidecine.html>.

---. ---. "Fondo para la producción cinematográfica de calidad (FOPROCINE); Largometrajes cinematográficos aprobados para recibir apoyo 2001-2010 (Al 20 de Noviembre)." Foprocine. 2010-2011. Web. 24 March 2012 <http://www.imcine.gob.mx/ foprocine.html>.

---. ---. “Fondo para la producción cinematográfica de calidad (FOPROCINE); Largometrajes cinematográficos aprobados para recibir apoyo 2001-2012 (Al 30 de abril).” Foprocine. Email correspondence with Juan Carlos Domínguez Domingo, IMCINE Análisis e Investigación. 21 June 2012.

---. ---. “Informe 2001-2006.” Informes Imcine. 2010-2011. Web. 24 March 2012 <http://www.imcine.gob.mx/informes-imcine.html>.

---. ---. “Informe anual 2007.” Informes Imcine. 2010-2011. Web. 24 March 2012 <http://www.imcine.gob.mx/informes-imcine.html>.

---. ---. “Informe anual 2008.” Informes Imcine. 2010-2011. Web. 24 March 2012 <http://www.imcine.gob.mx/informes-imcine.html>.

---. ---. “Informe anual 2009.” Informes Imcine. 2010-2011. Web. 24 March 2012 <http://www.imcine.gob.mx/informes-imcine.html>.

---. ---. “Informe anual 2010.” Informes Imcine. 2010-2011. Web. 24 March 2012 <http://www.imcine.gob.mx/informes-imcine.html>.

---. ---. “Informe anual 2011.” Informes Imcine. 2010-2011. Web. 24 March 2012 <http://www.imcine.gob.mx/informes-imcine.html>.

---. ---. Ingresos totales en las taquillas mexicanas 1989-2010. 2010-2011. Web. 11 Aug. 2012. <http://www.imcine.gob.mx/ingresos-totales-en-taquilla.html>.

---. ---. Línea de tiempo. IMCINE, 2010-2011. Web. 18-24 March 2012 <http://www.imcine.gob.mx/linea-de-tiempo.html>.

---. ---. Línea del tiempo. IMCINE, 2010-2014. Web. 14 June 2015 <http://www.imcine.gob.mx/linea-del-tiempo>.

---. ---. Múltiples rostros, múltiples miradas: Un imaginario fílmico. 25 años del Instituto Mexicano de Cinematografía. Mexico City: IMCINE, 2009. Print.

---. ---. “Películas estrenadas en México: Estrenos nacionales y extranjeros desde 1983 hasta 2011 (datos expresados en número de películas).” Distribución y exhibición cinematográfica. 2010-2013. Web. 27 June 2013 <http://www.imcine.gob.mx/pelculas-estrenadas-en-mxico-1.html>.

---. ---. “Premios internacionales de películas mexicanas de 2006 a 2011.” Email correspondence with Juan Carlos Domínguez Domingo, IMCINE Análisis e Investigación. 21 June 2012.

---. ---. “Proyectos de inversión aprobados en 2009.” Eficine 226. 2010-2011. Web. 02 May 2012 <http://www.imcine.gob.mx/eficine-226.html>.

---. ---. “Reglas de operación e indicadores de gestión y evaluación del Fondo de Inversión y Estímulos al Cine.” Fidecine. 2010-2011. Web. 21 March 2012 <http://www.imcine.gob.mx/fidecine.html>.

---. ---. “Reglas de operación e indicadores de gestión y evaluación del Fondo para la Producción Cinematográfica de Calidad.” Foprocine. 2010-2011. Web. 21 March 2012 <http://www.imcine.gob.mx/foprocine.html>.

México. Secretaría de Cultura. “Dará el Centro de Capacitación Cinematográfica curso de producción para dotar de soporte académico.” 02 Sept. 2010. Web. 26 May 2016. <http://www.cultura.gob.mx/noticias/cine-y-artes-audiovisuales/7348-dara-el-centro-de-capacitacion-cinematografica-curso-de-produccion-para-dotar-de-soporte-academico.html>.

“Mi vida dentro: Estreno nacional.” Morelia Film Fest, 15 Jan. 2009. Web. 24 May 2015 <http://moreliafilmfest.com/mi-vida-dentro-estreno-nacional>.

Michel, Daniela. Untitled Introduction. Morelia Lab 10 Años: Taller de formación y actualización para productores latinoamericanos. Morelia Lab. Instituto Mexicano de Cinematografía. Mexico City: IMCINE, 2014. 7. Print.

---. Skype interview. 22 Jan. 2013.

Miller, Toby, et al. Global Hollywood. London: BFI, 2001. Print.

Miller, Toby, et al. Global Hollywood 2. London: BFI, 2005. Print.

Minns, Adam. “Guadalajara Film Festival.” ScreenDaily.com. Media Business Insight Limited, 18 Mar. 2001. Web. 11 Oct. 2013 <http://www.screendaily.com/guadalajara-film-festival/405309.article>.

Monsiváis, Carlos. “Mexican Cinema: Of Myths and Demystifications.” Mediating Two Worlds: Cinematic Encounters in the Americas. Eds. John King, Ana M. López, and Manuel Alvarado. London: BFI, 1993. 139-46. Print.

Mora, Carl J. Mexican Cinema: Reflections of a Society 1896-1980. Berkeley: U of California P, 1982. Print.

---. Mexican Cinema: Reflections of a Society 1896-2004. 3rd ed. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2005. Print.

Morelia Lab. Morelia Lab 10 Años: Taller de formación y actualización para productores latinoamericanos. Instituto Mexicano de Cinematografía. Mexico City: IMCINE, 2014. Print.

---. “Morelia Lab 2007: Taller para jóvenes productores de Iberoamérica. Informe final.” Coordinación Ejecutiva del Morelia Lab 2007. Oct. 2007. Email correspondence with Andrea Stavenhagen. 04 June 2014.

---. “Morelia Lab 2009: Taller para jóvenes productores de Iberoamérica. Informe final.” Coordinación Ejecutiva del Morelia Lab 2009. Oct. 2009. Email correspondence with Andrea Stavenhagen. 04 June 2014.

Motion Picture Association of America. “Our Story.” Motion Picture Association of America. MPAA, 2015. Web. 02 July 2015 <http://www.mpaa.org/our-story>.

Muestra de Cine Mexicano en Guadalajara. X Muestra de Cine Mexicano en Guadalajara: Marzo de 1995. Festival Catalog. Guadalajara, Jalisco: UDG, 1995. Print.

---. XI Muestra de Cine Mexicano en Guadalajara: 18-23 Marzo de 1996. Festival Catalog. Guadalajara, Jalisco: Patronato de la Muestra de Cine Mexicano, 1996. Print.

---. XIII Muestra de Cine Mexicano en Guadalajara: Marzo 6-12 de 1998. Festival Catalog. Guadalajara, Jalisco: Patronato de la Muestra de Cine Mexicano, 1998. Print.

"Muestra producción fílmica mexicana un repunte entre 2006 y 2012." Notimex. 26 Dec. 2012. Latin American Newstand. ProQuest. Web. 22 Dec. 2014.

Mujeres en el Cine y la Televisión, México. Official Website. Mujeres en el Cine y la Televisión, S.A. MCYTV, 2013. Web. 20 Aug. 2013 <http://www.mujerescineytv.org>.

Negrete, Ángel. "FICM (3 de tantos)." ElSeptimoArte.net. El Séptimo Arte, 15 Sept. 2006. Web. 08 July 2012 <http://www.elseptimoarte.net/mexico/cine-articulo104.html>.

"Nora's Will." Official Website. Menemsha Films. Menemsha Films, 2008-2012. Web. 23 June 2014 <http://www.menemshafilms.com/noras-will.html>.

Noriega, Chon A. "Mexican Cinema in the United States: Introduction to the Essays." The Mexican Cinema Project. Eds. Chon A. Noriega and Steven Ricci. Los Angeles: UCLA Film and Television Archive, 1994. 1-6. Print.

---, ed. Visible Nations: Latin American Cinema and Video. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2000. Print.

Noriega, Chon A., and Steven Ricci, eds. The Mexican Cinema Project. Los Angeles: UCLA Film and Television Archive, [199?]. Print.

O'Boyle, Michael. "'Quinceanera' opens Morelia Fest." Variety.com. Variety, 06 Oct. 2006. Web. 10 July 2012 <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951453>.

O'Regan, Tom. "A National Cinema." The Film Cultures Reader. Ed. Graeme Turner. New York: Routledge, 1997. 139-64. Print.

Olvera, Verónica. "'Sienten' triunfo otra vez - Dice la directora que creía que su corto tenía posibilidades, pero no esperaba ganar." Reforma (Ciudad de México, Distrito Federal, Mexico) 23 Oct. 2006: Gente 6. Access World News. NewsBank. Web. 02 Sept. 2014.

Padilla López, Raúl. "Consolidando una tradición." XX años de cine mexicano en Guadalajara 1986-2005. Guadalajara, Mexico: Patronato de la Muestra de Cine Mexicano en Guadalajara, 2005. 201- 205. Print.

Paranaguá, Paulo Antonio, ed. Mexican Cinema. Trans. Ana M. López. London: BFI, 1995. Print.

"Pastorela (2011)." Box Office Mojo. IMDb.com. Web. 27 May 2015 <http://www.boxofficemojo.com/movies/?id=pastorela.htm>.

Pereda, Nicolás. Skype interview. 16 Jan. 2013.

Pérez Turrent, Tomás. "Crises and Renovations (1965-91)." Mexican Cinema. Ed. Paulo Antonio Paranaguá. Trans. Ana M. López. London: BFI, 1995. 94-115. Print.

---. "The Studios." Mexican Cinema. Ed. Paulo Antonio Paranaguá. Trans. Ana M. López. London: BFI, 1995. 133-44. Print.

"Peter Greenaway—Live Cinema." NoTV Visual Music. NoTV, last update 19 July 2011. Web. 28 July 2015 <http://www.notv.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=34 &Itemid=58#.Vb6itUU2Ijg>.

Peterson, Macauley. "From Argentina to Zambia: The Rotterdam Film Festival Finds Movies that Matter." Arts Engine: Media that Matters. MediaRights, 17 Apr. 2007. Web. 20 Aug. 2012 <http://www.mediarights.org/news/From_Argentina_to_Zambia_The_Rotterdam_Film_Festival_Finds_Movies_that_Matt>.

Pineda, Alexandra, and Paulo Antonio Paranaguá. "Mexico and Its Cinema." Mexican Cinema. Ed. Paulo Antonio Paranaguá. Trans. Ana M. López. London: BFI, 1995. 15-61. Print.

Pons, Arturo. Skype interview. 30 Jan. 2013.

Porton, Richard, ed. Dekalog 3: On Film Festivals. New York: Wallflower, 2009. Print.

Pribram, E. Deidre. Cinema and Culture: Independent Film in the United States, 1980-2001. Framing Film 2. New York: Peter Lang, 2002. Print.

Quijano, Julio A. "Apoyarán a jóvenes productores de cine." El Universal 08 July 2005. Latin American Newstand. ProQuest. Web. 22 Dec. 2014.

"Quince películas iberoamericanas concursarán en Guadalajara." ElUniverso.com. El Universo, 8 Mar. 2004. Web. 18 May 2014 <http://www.eluniverso.com/2004/03/08/0001/260/5602E471132A41F29B4836C8659D5E03.html>.

Ramírez González, Ozcar. Skype interview. 10 Jan. 2013.

---. Message to the author. 28 Aug. 2013. E-mail.

Rashkin, Elissa J. Women Filmmakers in Mexico: The Country of Which We Dream. Austin: U of Texas P, 2001. Print.

Reyes, Aurelio de los. "The Studios." Mexican Cinema. Ed. Paulo Antonio Paranaguá. Trans. Ana M. López. London: BFI, 1995. 63-78. Print.

Rhyne, Ragan. "Film Festival Circuits and Stakeholders." Film Festival Yearbook 1: The Festival Circuit. Eds. Dina Iordanova and Ragan Rhyne. St. Andrews, Scotland, UK: St. Andrews Film Studies, 2009. 9-22. Print.

Rivera Aubert, Claudia. Message to the author. 17 Aug. 2013. E-mail.

---. Message to the author. 24 Oct. 2012. LinkedIn.

Rosas, Héctor. "Un festival las reúne." El Norte (Monterrey, Nuevo León, Mexico) 31 July 2001: Gente 3. Access World News. NewsBank. Web. 18 Aug. 2013.

Ross, Miriam. "The Film Festival as Producer: Latin American Films and Rotterdam's Hubert Bals Fund." Screen 52.2 (2011): 261-67. Print.

Rovzar, Fernando. "Know Thy Audience." TedxTalks. TEDxSanMigueldeAllende. San Miguel de Allende, Guanajuato, Mexico. 06 Aug. 2011. Public address. Web. 02 May 2012 <http://tedxtalks.ted.com/video/TEDxSanMigueldeAllende-Fernando>.

Rüling, Charles-Clemens. "Festivals as Field-configuring Events: The Annecy International Animated Film Festival and Market." Film Festival Yearbook 1: The Festival Circuit. Eds. Dina Iordanova and Ragan Rhyne. St. Andrews, Scotland, UK: St. Andrews Film Studies, 2009. 49-66. Print.

Saragoza, Alex M., with Graciela Berkovich. "Intimate Connections: Cinematic Allegories of Gender, the State and National Identity." The Mexican Cinema Project. Eds. Chon A. Noriega and Steven Ricci. Los Angeles: UCLA Film and Television Archive, 1994. 25-32. Print.

Schatz, Thomas. "Film Industry Studies and Hollywood History." Media Industries: History, Theory, and Method. Eds. Jennifer Holt and Alisa Perren. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. 45-56. Print.

---. "The New Hollywood." The Film Cultures Reader. Ed. Graeme Turner. New York: Routledge, 1997. 184-205. Print.

---. "The Return of the Hollywood Studio System." Conglomerates and the Media. Ed. Erik Barnauw, et al. New York: New Press, 1997. 73-106. Print.

Schmucler, Abril. Skype interview. 14 Jan. 2013.

Smith, Paul Julian. Amores Perros. London: BFI, 2003. Print.

Snider, Sarah. "The Tulse Luper Suitcases: A Personal History of Uranium: Peter Greenaway." Culture Wars. Culture Wars, 26 Apr. 2007. Web. 28 July 2015 <http://www.culturewars.org.uk/2007-04/tulseluper.htm>.

"Sobre Vaho." Vaho, Memoria de un largometraje mexicano. Albricias Producción, n.d. Web. 14 June 2014 <http://vaho.wordpress.com/acerca-de/>.

Stavenhagen, Andrea. "Morelia Lab Doc." Email correspondence with Andrea Stavenhagen. 09 Jan. 2013.

---. "Seguimiento de proyectos—Encuentro de Coproducción 2005 y 2007." Email correspondence with Andrea Stavenhagen. 03 Sept. 2013.

---. Skype interview. 09 Jan. 2013.

Stavenhagen, Andrea, and Carlos Taibo. "10 años formando productores." Morelia Lab 10 Años: Taller de formación y actualización para productores latinoamericanos. Morelia Lab. Instituto Mexicano de Cinematografía. Mexico City: IMCINE, 2014. Print. 12-13.

Stavenhagen, Marina. "Prólogo." Múltiples rostros, múltiples miradas: Un imaginario fílmico. 25 años del Instituto Mexicano de Cinematografía. Mexico City: IMCINE, 2009. Print. 8-9.

Steinhart, Daniel. "Fostering International Cinema: The Rotterdam Film Festival, CineMart, and Hubert Bals Fund." Mediascape 2 (2006): 1–13. Web. 02 Dec. 2011 <http://www.tft.ucla.edu/mediascape/Spring06_FosteringInternationalCinema.pdf>.

Suárez, Cecilia. "Me es imperdonable no asisitir al FICM." Hacia los 10 años: Memorias de un espectador. Morelia Film Fest, n.d. Web. 04 Aug. 2014 <http://moreliafilmfest.com/?seccion=memorias-de-un-espectador&ficm_ediciones_tax=hacia-los-10-anos>.

Sutter, Mary, and Simeon Tegel. "Mexican Pic Fee Hit: Valenti Complains to Fox about Peso Levy." Variety.com. Variety, 10 Feb. 2003. Web. 29 May 2012 <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117880360>.

Taibo, Carlos. Manual básico de producción cinematográfica. With collaborators Martha Orozco and Sandra Paredes. Mexico City: IMCINE, CCC, CUEC, 2011. Print.

---. Skype interview. 26 Apr. 2013.

"Tarantino Opens Mexican Film Festival." AFP - Relaxnews (English International Version). 30 Sept. 2009. Relaxnews. LexisNexis. Web. 05 Oct. 2014.

Teissl, Verena. "La conquista del espacio urbano, útimo tabú del cine mexicano: las identidades cinematográficas de la Ciudad de México." Negociando identidades, traspasando fronteras: Tendencias en la literatura y el cine mexicanos en torno al nuevo milenio. Eds. Susanne Igler and Thomas Stauder. Estudios latinoamericanos 49. Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2008. 229-44. Print.

"Tendrá Festival de Cine de Guanajuato diversos eventos en Cannes." Notimex. 12 May 2011. Latin American Newstand. ProQuest. Web. 08 Apr. 2013.

"Termina Morelia Lab." Mural: Gente 6. 15 Oct. 2005. Latin American Newstand. ProQuest. Web. 22 Dec. 2014.

Turner, Graeme, ed. The Film Cultures Reader. New York: Routledge, 2002. Print.

Ugalde, Víctor. "La sociedad fílmica organizada y el Imcine." Múltiples rostros, múltiples miradas: Un imaginario fílmico. 25 años del Instituto Mexicano de Cinematografía. Mexico City: IMCINE, 2009. 115-27. Print.

---. Skype interview. 09 May 2013.

Uribe González, Karla. Skype interview. 01 May 2013.

Uribe, Victor Omar. "El cine se impuso al glamour." El Observante 21 Oct. 2005. Web. 27 Dec. 2014 <http://elobservante.blogspot.com/2005/10/el-cine-se-impuso-al-glamour-logra-el_21.html>.

Usabel, Gaizka S. The High Noon of American Films in Latin America. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1982. Print.

Valenzuela Zapata, Ana G. and Marie-Sarita Gaytán. "Mayahuel la diosa pulquera." La Jornada en la Ciencia. DEMOS, n.d. Web. 22 June 2015 <http://ciencias.jornada.com.mx/investigacion/ciencias-quimicas-y-de-la-vida/investigacion/mayahuel-la-diosa-pulquera>.

Vega Alfaro, Eduardo de la. "Origins, Development and Crisis of the Sound Cinema (1929-64)." Mexican Cinema. Ed. Paulo Antonio Paranaguá. Trans. Ana M. López. London: BFI, 1995. 79-93. Print.

Vega Zaragoza, Guillermo. "'Pastorela': judiciales versus exorcistas. Una comedia de vicios." Cine Toma, Revista Mexican de Cine 19 (2011). Mexico City, Mexico: PasodeGato, 2011. Web. 27 May 2015 <https://revistatoma.wordpress.com/tag/pastorela>.

Villa-Flores, Javier. "Plotting a Fire: The Burning of Mexico's Cineteca Nacional and the Idea of a Self-Destructing Archive." Loss and Recovery of Archives and Libraries in Modern Latin America. Eds. Carlos Aguirre and Javier Villa-Flores. Raleigh, NC: A Contracorriente, 2015. 197-226. Academia.edu. Web. 14 July 2016 <http://www.academia.edu/12776300/Plotting_a_Fire_The_Burning_of_Mexicos_Cineteca_Nacional_and_the_Idea_of_a_Self-Destructing_Archive>.

Villa Smythe, Hugo. Skype interview. 10 Jan. 2013.

West, Dennis. "Confronting the Crisis in Mexican Cinema." INTI, Revista de literatura hispánica 29-30 (1989): 215-18. JSTOR. Web. 24 Jan. 2014.

---. "Mexican Film Festival." In "The Hispanic and Luso-Brazilian World" prepared by George R. McMurray. Hispania 72:3 (1989): 595-56. JSTOR. Web. 24 Jan. 2014.

Wong, Cindy Hing-Yuk. Film Festivals: Culture, People, and Power on the Global Screen. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP. 2011. Print.

Wood, Robin. "Notes for the Exploration of Hermosillo." Cineaction! 5 (1986): 32-38. Print.

Wyatt, Justin. "From Roadshowing to Saturation Release: Majors, Independents, and Marketing/Distribution Innovations." The New American Cinema. Ed. Jon Lewis. Durham: Duke UP, 1998. 64-86. Print.

---. High Concept: Movies and Marketing in Hollywood. Austin: U of Texas P, 1994. Print.

XX años de cine mexicano en Guadalajara 1986-2005. Guadalajara, Mexico: Patronato de la Muestra de Cine Mexicano en Guadalajara, 2005. Print.

"Y tu mamá también (2002): Domestic Total Gross." Box Office Mojo. IMDb.com. Web. 29 June 2013 <http://boxofficemojo.com/movies/?id=ytumamatambien.htm>.

Young, James. "Early Warnings: Despite Its Low Business Profile, Morelia Can Still Be a Dealmaker." Variety 10 Oct. 2011. Reed Business Info. LexisNexis. Web. 22 Dec. 2014.

---. "Morelia Fest Hits on Growth Spurt." Daily Variety 26 Aug. 2008. Reed Elsevier Inc. LexisNexis. Web. 05 Oct. 2014.

Zimbrón, Leonardo. Skype interview. 07 Aug. 2012.

Vita

Jean Anne Lauer is a graduate of Waverly High School, Lansing, MI. She completed a dual Bachelor of Arts degree in Chemistry and Spanish at Albion College, Albion, MI. At Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, Jean earned two Master of Arts degrees, one in Spanish and one in Humanities. Following this, she moved to attend the University of Texas at Austin. While completing requirements there for her Ph.D., she has worked as a Professor, Adjunct, of Humanities at Austin Community College, and as Film Programmer and then Festival Director at Cine Las Americas International Film Festival, among other professional pursuits.

Email: jalauer@utexas.edu

This dissertation was typed by the author.